

Utah State University

DigitalCommons@USU

All Graduate Theses and Dissertations

Graduate Studies

5-1993

Conceptualizing the Youthful Male Sex Offender: A Meta-Analytic Examination of Offender Characteristics by Offense Type

Roger B. Graves

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd>



Part of the [Psychology Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Graves, Roger B., "Conceptualizing the Youthful Male Sex Offender: A Meta-Analytic Examination of Offender Characteristics by Offense Type" (1993). *All Graduate Theses and Dissertations*. 2377.
<https://digitalcommons.usu.edu/etd/2377>

This Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate Studies at DigitalCommons@USU. It has been accepted for inclusion in All Graduate Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@USU. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@usu.edu.



Copyright © Roger B. Graves 1993
All Rights Reserved

CONCEPTUALIZING THE YOUTHFUL MALE SEX OFFENDER: A
META-ANALYTIC EXAMINATION OF OFFENDER
CHARACTERISTICS BY OFFENSE TYPE

by

Roger B. Graves

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree

of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

in

Psychology

Approved:

UTAH STATE UNIVERSITY
Logan, Utah

1993

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This project was a major undertaking that would not have been possible without the help and assistance of numerous persons. I am greatly indebted to my mentors, D. Kim Openshaw, a dear and very wise friend, for always "being there" and for all the much needed encouragement and advice when the going got tough, and Frank Ascione for his support and expert assistance over the last three years.

To Susan Erickson, this couldn't have been achieved without your help--you have my sincerest thanks. To Roxanne Pfister, thanks for the hours and hours of statistical consultation you provided; it was invaluable and I'm in your debt. My thanks also goes to Karl White for his expert feedback on the pilot project. To all the graduate and undergraduate students who spent literally hundreds of hours reading, coding, checking, and entering data, congratulations on a job well done, and thank you.

To Professors Carolyn Barcus, Susan Crowley, and Donald Sisson, a very sincere thanks for your patience, understanding, and time on what was a very challenging task. Also to Carolyn, you were a true friend when I needed one most, and thanks for caring.

Finally, to my lovely wife, Gena, and my children, Andrea and Gaelan, I am most in debt. God bless you; I love you.

Roger B. Graves

CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	ii
LIST OF TABLES.....	vi
ABSTRACT.....	ix
CHAPTER	
1. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM.....	1
Introduction.....	1
Purpose and Objectives.....	4
Hypotheses.....	5
2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE.....	8
Ambiguities and Shortcomings in the Historical Conceptualization of Youthful Sex Offenders.....	8
Conceptual Ambiguity.....	8
Methodological Shortcomings.....	10
Intervention Ambiguity.....	16
Narrative Reviews of the Literature.....	17
Research Integration: The Meta-Analytic Method.....	19
3. METHODOLOGY.....	22
Sample Inclusion Criteria.....	22
The Coding Sheet.....	23
Coding Subjective Variables.....	25
Analysis Procedures.....	27
Descriptive Analysis.....	27
Inferential Analysis.....	29
4. RESULTS.....	31
Interrater Reliability.....	33
Objective Variables.....	33
Subjective Variables.....	34

CONTENTS

	Page
Descriptive and Inferential Analyses For Quality 1 - 3 Samples.....	35
Demographic Characteristics.....	35
Parental and Family Characteristics.....	43
Youth Sex Offender Medical/ Psychiatric History.....	53
Youth Sex Offender Educational Histories.....	57
Interpersonal Relationship Characteristics.....	60
General Behavioral Interaction Characteristics.....	65
History of Childhood Victimization and Perpetrators in Youth Sex Offenders.....	68
History of Nonsexual Criminal Offenses and Outcomes.....	73
Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for the First Reported Sex Offense.....	79
Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for All Reported Sex Offenses.....	83
Use of Disinhibiting Agents as Related to Sexually Offensive Behavior.....	92
Descriptive Analysis for Combined Quality 1 and 2 Samples.....	94
Demographic Characteristics.....	94
Parental and Family Characteristics.....	96
Youth Sex Offender Medical/ Psychiatric Histories.....	98
Youth Sex Offender Educational Histories.....	99
Interpersonal Relationship Characteristics.....	100
General Behavioral Interaction Characteristics.....	101

CONTENTS

	Page
History of Childhood Victimization and Perpetrators in Youth Sex Offenders.....	102
History of Nonsex Criminal Offenses and Outcomes.....	103
Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for the First Reported Sex Offense.....	103
Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for All Reported Sex Offenses.....	104
Use of Disinhibiting Agents as Related to Sexually Offensive Behavior.....	106
 5. IMPLICATIONS.....	 107
Typological Considerations.....	107
Data Limitations.....	107
Sexual Assault Offenders.....	109
Pedophilic Youth.....	113
Mixed Offense Offenders.....	118
Combined Youth Sex Offenders.....	123
 6. CONCLUSIONS.....	 131
Recommendations for Future Research.....	135
REFERENCES.....	139
APPENDICES.....	162
Appendix A: Definition of Terms.....	163
Appendix B: Variables Implicated in Youthful Sex Offending as Noted in the Literature.....	167
Appendix C: Coding Form.....	170
Appendix D: Interrater Reliabilities.....	185
Appendix E: Tables 20 - 30. Descriptives for Quality 1 - 2 Samples.....	187
Appendix F: A Listing of Sample Sources Used in this Meta-Analysis.....	203
VITA.....	207

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	Methodological Problems Common to Empirical Studies of Youthful Sex Offenders.....	12
2	General Demographic Characteristics for Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	36
3	Parental and Family Characteristics for Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	44
4	Youth Sex Offender Medical/Psychiatric Histories (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	54
5	Youth Sex Offender Educational Histories (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	58
6	Youth Sex Offender Interpersonal Relationship Characteristics (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	61
7	Youth Sex Offender General Behavioral Interaction Characteristics (Quality 1-3 Samples).....	66
8	History of Childhood Victimization and Perpetrators in Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	69
9	History of Nonsex Criminal Offenses and Outcomes in Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	74
10	Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for First Reported Sex Offense (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	80
11	Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for All Reported Offenses (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	84
12	Youth Sex Offender Characteristics Allegedly Related to Offense Behavior (Quality 1 - 3 Samples).....	93
13	Clinically Relevant Characteristics of Youth Sexual Assault Offenders.....	110
14	Clinically Relevant Characteristics of Pedophilic Youth.....	114

Table	Page
15	Clinically Relevant Characteristics of Mixed Offense Offenders.....119
16	Clinically Relevant Characteristics of All Offenders Combined.....124
17	A Comparative Summary of the Typological Characteristics for Three Subgroups of Youth Sex Offenders.....129
18	Summary of Variables Clinically Implicated in Youthful Sexual Offending as Noted in Literature Reviews (Not Exhaustive).....168
19	Interrater Reliabilities for 20 Objective and 3 Subjective Variables (Rounded to the nearest .01).....186
20	General Demographic Characteristics for Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....188
21	Parental and Family Characteristics for Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....190
22	Youth Sex Offender Medical/Psychiatric Histories (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....193
23	Youth Sex Offender Educational Histories (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....194
24	Youth Sex Offender Interpersonal Relationship Characteristics (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....195
25	Youth Sex Offender General Behavioral Interaction Characteristics (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....196
26	History of Childhood Victimization and Perpetrators in Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....197
27	History of Nonsex Criminal Offenses and Outcomes in Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....198
28	Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for First Reported Sex Offense (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....199

Table		Page
29	Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for All Reported Offenses (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....	200
30	Youth Sex Offender Characteristics Allegedly Related to Offense Behavior (Quality 1 - 2 Samples).....	202

ABSTRACT

Conceptualizing the Youthful Male Sex Offender: A
Meta-Analytic Examination of Offender
Characteristics by Offense Type

by

Roger B. Graves, Doctor of Philosophy
Utah State University, 1993

Major Professors: Frank R. Ascione, D. Kim Openshaw
Department: Psychology

A review of the literature demonstrates that, to date, no concerted effort has been made to conceptualize and develop typologies for youthful male sex offenders on the basis of offense type. Such typologies are deemed important to the understanding of possible developmental antecedents for sexual offending, as well as to the development of theory-driven, empirically based interventions and preventions. This study attempts to begin the conceptualization process through a meta-analytic examination of 140 research samples that provide data on over 16,000 individuals who have committed sexual offenses as youth. Three subtypes of offenders are identified on the basis of offense type: sexual assault offenders, pedophilic offenders (those who molest children significantly younger than they are), and mixed offense offenders (those who

commit multiple types of offenses, e.g., voyeurism, sexual assault, and pedophilic acts). The paucity of research that exists for youth voyeurs and exhibitionists precluded the inclusion of these and other "hands-off" offense subtypes. Descriptive and inferential analyses are conducted and described, typologies are presented, and implications for treatment are suggested. Recommendations for future research are made.

CHAPTER 1

DEVELOPMENT OF THE PROBLEM

Introduction

Despite greater awareness and increased funding for treatment programs, the incidence of sexual offenses perpetrated by minors continues to grow at an alarming rate. According to the Uniform Crime Report (U.S. Department of Justice, 1990) the incidence of sexual offenses perpetrated by minor-age boys continues to grow at the rate of nearly 10% per year. In Utah, according to the Utah Network on Juveniles Offending Sexually (NOJOS, 1989), the reported incidence of all sex offenses perpetrated by juveniles increased by 55% during the 5-year period between 1983 and 1987. Rape perpetrated by adolescent boys increased well over 30% between 1989 and 1990 alone (Crime in Utah, 1990). Other states report similar increases for the same time period. Furthermore, sexual offenses committed by female youth are becoming an increasing concern (Fehrenbach, & Monastersky, 1988; Matthews, Matthews, & Speltz, 1989; Matthews, 1987; Scavo, 1989).

Sexual offending during childhood and adolescence may be the beginning of a long-term pattern of behavior. Stenson and Anderson (1987) (see also Knopp, 1982; Longo & Groth, 1983) have observed that adult sex offenders frequently report having begun their sex-offending careers during adolescence or even earlier. In addition, some

researchers suggest that a history of sexual victimization may have a direct role (at least in some instances) in the development of sexually offensive behavior as the child grows older (Kahn & Lafond, 1988; Longo, 1982; Ryan, 1989).

Taken together, the continuing increase in incidence rates, the apparent connection between youthful and adult offending, and the possible relation between sexual victimization and later offending warrant concern over both present and future costs to society. In terms of the present, human suffering (as a consequence of sexual victimization) is on the increase and the financial resources required to contain exploding prison populations, as well as develop effective treatment programs, are taxing already limited national and local resources. As for the future, without the development and implementation of effective prevention and intervention programs, costs will continue to escalate as the juvenile offender continues his or her abusive activity into adulthood.

Effective prevention and intervention programs for at-risk individuals and juvenile offenders, respectively, are important keys for obtaining a reduction in the incidence of youthful sex offenses. In addition, if juvenile offending is a precursor to adult offending, such programs may have the additional long-term benefit of helping to stem the increases observed in the incidence of sex offenses committed by adults.

Existing intervention programs for juvenile sex offenders are theoretically diverse, including family systems, cognitive-behavioral and psychoanalytic approaches (Lanyon, 1986), 12-step programs (Cunningham & MacFarlane, 1988), and relapse prevention programs (Pithers, Kashima, Cummings, Beal, & Buell, 1988; see also Laws, 1989). Such programs frequently involve covert sensitization (Becker, Kaplan, & Kavoussi, 1988), aversion therapy (Quinsey, 1977), confrontation of dysfunctional attitudes (Kahn & LaFond, 1988), social skills training and related psychoeducational approaches (Graves, Openshaw, & Adams, 1992; Haines, Herrman, Baker, & Gaber, 1986), and other techniques (Hollin & Howells, 1991; Smets & Cebula, 1987). Yet the variability among intervention paradigms and procedures appears to represent uncertainty regarding important etiological factors associated with youthful sex offending, and hence, the actual treatment needs for this population. The result is a "shotgun approach" to intervention whereby anything and everything might be tried in an attempt to maximize the likelihood of hitting relevant treatment issues. Furthermore, there is virtually no understanding of how these youth differ by offense subtype (e.g., sexual assault offenders, child molesters, exhibitionists, etc.), or from other groups of delinquent youth not offending sexually, or from normal youth (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987).

A review of the literature reveals that although a

number of developmental variables and psychosocial characteristics have been implicated in juvenile sex offending, the findings are equivocal. To date, the research addressing typological descriptions consists largely of retrospective and anecdotal reports, or limited empirical studies with small and/or nonrepresentative samples and highly questionable external validity. Furthermore, no review has yet been conducted that integrates the existing research findings (anecdotal or otherwise). At present then, there is no defensible conceptualization of the youthful sex offender upon which to base theoretically derived intervention/prevention procedures (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Graves et al., 1992).

Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to begin filling the existing conceptual void concerning the typological features of juvenile male sex offenders and their offense characteristics. Initially, an integrative review and analysis of the existing literature concerning demographic and interpersonal relationship variables (family and peer), history of offender victimization (sexual, physical and emotional), and criminal and academic history for juvenile sex offenders as a group were conducted. Variables from these broad categories are frequently alleged to be associated with youthful sex offending (e.g., Davis &

Leitenberg, 1987; Becker, Cunningham-Rathner, & Kaplan, 1986a; Blaske, Borduin, Henggler, & Mann, 1989; Deisher, Wenet, Paperny, Clark, & Fehrenbach, 1982).

In the next phase, preliminary comparisons on these variables between juvenile sex offenders of various subtypes (i.e., sexual assault offenders, child molesters or pedophilic-like offenders, exhibitionists, voyeurs, and mixed offense or unspecified) were made. This procedure sorts out and identifies particular variables that appear to be associated with specific types of offending behaviors. For example, Graves et al. (1992) suggested that juvenile sex offenders may exhibit a social competence deficit. Supported in this study, inferential statistical procedures were then used to determine if the finding was equally true for different subtypes of offenders, for example, rapists versus pedophiles versus mixed offense offenders.

Hypotheses

Convention dictates that null hypotheses be constructed and tested to assess whether or not any sample deviations from the null meet predetermined levels of statistical significance. Statistical operations test that given that the null hypothesis is true, the probability of the sample data is "p" (typically .05 is considered statistically significant) (Cohen, 1990). The statistical test is conducted on the data and not the hypothesis; hence,

significant deviations from the null hypothesis warrant considerations of alternative explanations or hypotheses for the data. Alternative hypotheses are frequently formulated prior to data analysis as a means to predict the direction any deviation from the null hypothesis might take.

Rejecting the null hypothesis does not make a specific alternative true, simply more tenable, especially when the research design and methodology limit the number of potential alternative explanations. Together, these procedures are particularly useful in determining the effects of interventions and in testing theory.

Because this study does not entail an intervention, or make theoretically based predictions about any differences between the samples examined, alternative hypotheses were not explicitly generated for individual tests. However, the goal was to examine whether or not, and how, youthful sex offenders differ by offense subtype on a variety of variables alleged in the literature to be associated with sexual acting-out. Therefore, the general implicit null hypothesis was that juvenile sex offenders represent a highly heterogeneous group with no consistent similarities or differences either among them as a group, or between the various subgroups of sex offenders examined. Specific to each phase of the study, the hypotheses were as follows:

1. There are no consistent similarities or differences in the research on juvenile sex offenders as a group for the

demographic, interpersonal relationship, history of offender victimization, criminal, or academic variables examined.

2. There are no consistent similarities or differences distinguishing subtypes of juvenile sex offenders (i.e., pedophilic, sexual assault offenders, exhibitionists, voyeurs, and mixed offense offenders) on the demographic, interpersonal relationship, history of offender victimization, criminal, or academic variables examined.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Ambiguities and Shortcomings in the Historical Conceptualization of Youthful Sex Offenders

Historically, an understanding of who the youthful sexual offender is, and what constitutes a "sexual offense," is unclear due to important conceptual and methodological ambiguities in the research and clinical literature. As pointed out earlier, the lack of an empirically based etiological model, upon which to base treatment, has resulted in a third--even more serious--issue, that of an ambiguity in what constitutes an effective and efficient intervention program designed to achieve some desired treatment outcome, such as the long-term remission of sexual offending behavior.

Conceptual Ambiguity

Only within the past decade have youthful sex offenses begun to receive serious consideration as evidence of psychopathology, as violations of socially appropriate behavior, and as traumatic experiences perpetrated against hapless victims (National Adolescent Perpetrators Network, 1988). Two factors have been largely responsible for the conceptual ambiguity, and perhaps even the perpetuation, of youthful sexual offending. The first factor was the social attitude characterizing youth sexual offenses as sexual

experimentation, curiosity, and even "normal" expressions of aggression in maturing adolescent males (Becker & Abel, 1985). The second factor involved the disposition of the juvenile court system that, in an effort to avoid stigmatizing the adolescent, took the view that youth sex offenses were somehow less serious than those committed by adults (Groth, 1977; Becker & Abel, 1985).

However, within the last 5 to 10 years there has been a dramatic change in social, legal, and mental health or clinical attitudes concerning youthful sex offenders and their offenses, especially "hands-on" or contact offenses (Becker & Abel, 1985; Breer, 1987; Johnson, 1988; National Institute of Mental Health [NIMH], 1985). Due largely to the severe consequences sexual offenses have on their victims (Pettis & Hughes, 1985), youthful sexual offenses, even those perpetrated by preadolescent offenders, are being recognized as serious deviations from normal, age-appropriate sexual behavior (Johnson, 1988; NIMH, 1985). The result has been a near exponential growth in published research on youthful sexual offenders. Nevertheless, because the research is not systematic and tends to focus on intervention rather than conceptualization, we still do not know what individual, social, or contextual variables are important etiological factors in youthful sexual offending (Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Graves et al., 1992).

Methodological Shortcomings

The frequent inconsistencies, and even contradictions, concerning the importance of various correlates of sexual offending in youth are due, in part, to serious methodological and design flaws in the existing research. For example, a sample of frequently cited studies suggests the following may be important issues in the youthful (generally male) sex offender: low self-esteem (Deisher et al., 1982; Ryan, Lane, Davis, & Issac, 1987), an unstable family environment, or one where parents lack appropriate parenting skills (Fehrenbach, Smith, Monastersky, & Deisher, 1986), a history of previous sexual offenses (Becker et al., 1986a), and nonsexual delinquent behavior (Ageton, 1983; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Ryan et al., 1987; Shoor, Speed, & Bartlet, 1966), including animal cruelty (Ascione, 1993; Tingle, Barnard, Robbins, Newman, & Hutchison, 1986), being victims themselves of sexual and/or other physical abuse (Longo, 1982; Ryan et al., 1987), and lacking of appropriate social skills and/or social competence (Blaske et al., 1989; Deisher et al., 1982; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Groth, 1977; Porter, 1990; Quinsey, 1977; Shoor et al., 1966).

However, an examination of the methodologies employed in the 13 empirical studies noted here and in the introduction reveals that in every case at least two of five potentially serious methodological flaws exist: small sample size, nonrepresentative sample, retrospective accounts, mixed

group confounds, and/or limited data gathering techniques. Table 1 summarizes several examples of these methodological issues from the 13 studies cited earlier.

Small sample size is a methodological problem with much of the research in this area. Probably due to the difficulty in recruiting youth sex offenders to participate in research, it is not uncommon for study samples to range in size from single subject case studies to fewer than 20 individuals per group. Small samples can present problems with both reliability and validity of findings, and this problem is compounded when selection procedures are biased, as in each of the cases above.

Ryan et al. (1987) noted that youthful sex offenders require treatment with "special tools" available only in specially designed programs. However, her description of the offender, the components of the sexual assault cycle, and her treatment recommendations are all apparently based on three case studies, each representing a different type of offender.

Porter's (1990) sample size cannot be specifically determined. She noted that three groups of 10 subjects each were originally recruited, but that the "turn down" rate for "some" of the groups was 50%, leaving a total sample size somewhere between 15 and 25 subjects. Furthermore, she used analysis of variance (ANOVA), analysis of covariance (ANCOVA) and discriminant analysis techniques without

Table 1

Methodological Problems Common to Empirical Studies of
Youthful Sex Offenders

Study	Type of Problem
Ageton (1983)	2,4,5
Becker et al. (1986a)	2,5
Blaske et al. (1989)	1,2,4
Deisher et al. (1982)	2,5
Fehrenbach et al. (1986)	2,5
Groth (1977)	2,3,4
Longo (1982)	1,2,4,5
Longo & Groth (1983)	2,3,5
Porter (1990)	1,2,4
Ryan et al. (1987)	1,2,4,5
Shoor et al. (1966)	2,5 (also dated)
Smith et al. (1987)	2,4,5
Tingle et al. (1986)	2,3,5

Note. (1) Small n (< 20/sample), (2) Sample bias, potentially not representative of population, (3) Retrospective accounts (adult sample), (4) Mixed subtype confounds, (5) Potentially biased or subjective data gathering techniques.

mentioning how "significant" findings might be compromised by her relatively small biased sample.

The studies of Longo (1982) and Blaske et al. (1989) also have small samples. However, some effort is made to

control for, and make the reader aware of, potentially important validity issues. Longo (1982) provided highly detailed information about each subject and was much more conservative in his analysis and recommendations. Blaske et al. (1989) used three matched groups and were also conservative concerning interpretations.

Lack of a random, or even quasi-random, sample from a well defined population is a serious problem with most of the research in this area. Ageton's (1983) study involving 1,725 subjects obtained nationwide, via multistage cluster sampling, probably contains the most representative (i.e., most random) sample of the studies noted above. However, an initial subject loss of 27% and total loss of over 40% during the 5-year period of the study make the representativeness of even this large sample suspect. Ageton reported that her sample retained national representativeness with respect to sex, age, race, social class, and place of residence. Nevertheless, the sensitive nature of the research topic may have contributed substantially to whether certain segments of the population were willing to continue to participate in a study examining adolescent sexual offending.

The majority of empirical studies use samples obtained from treatment facilities (e.g., Deisher et al., 1982; Fehrenbach et al., 1986), probation and parole (e.g., Becker et al., 1986a; Shoor et al., 1966), or prisons (Longo &

Groth, 1983). Such limited sources of subjects may provide easily available pools of subjects, but unfortunately these pools may not be entirely representative of the target population since they only represent that portion of the population whose sexual offense(s) are known to professionals (Finkelhor, 1986). To date, no study has systematically compared the findings from captive samples (such as those noted above) with those from potentially less biased samples (e.g., Ageton, 1983)

Frequently, adult subjects are asked to provide retrospectively pertinent information about their youth as a means of detailing preadult events and developmental variables that may be associated with sexual offending. For example, Groth's (1977) landmark study, describing the adolescent male sex offender and his "prey," examined information from 63 subjects, 37 (59%) of whom were adults asked to recall data about their youth. Other studies rely entirely on adult recollections as a means of gathering juvenile data (e.g., Longo & Groth, 1983; Tingle et al., 1986). Adult retrospective accounts are not inherently unreliable, but may pose an increased risk for recall error due to retrieval failure, memory decay, interference, and/or distortions resulting from later learnings, biases, etc. (Leahey & Harris, 1989).

The methodological concern that may present the most serious threat to the development of an accurate

conceptualization is that of mixing individuals with different offense histories into a single study group. Such an approach assumes, for example, that rapists do not differ from child molesters or exhibitionists on pertinent variables.

Recent research suggests that this assumption may not be valid. For example, Tingle et al. (1986) reported that rapists are significantly more likely to have a history of aggressive behavior and school problems, and come from single parent families. Further, Cohen, Seghorn, and Calmas (1969) and Segal and Marshall (1985) have reported that, at least for adult sex offenders, rapists exhibit significantly higher levels of social competence than do child molesters.

If subgroups of youth sex offenders do differ on important variables, then combining their data may result in potentially important differences being lost in the statistical analysis. Unfortunately, of the studies reported above, nearly half used mixed group samples (Blaske et al., 1989; Groth, 1977; Longo, 1982; Porter, 1990; Ryan et al., 1987; Smith, Monastersky, & Deisher, 1987).

The final methodological concern, noted here, has to do with how the data were gathered. By far the most common method employed to obtain relevant data was through interviews or questionnaires (85% of the studies examined above). Only two studies (Blaske et al., 1989; Porter, 1990) used standardized instruments, and in the case of

Porter (1990) the instruments were projectives (e.g., Thematic Apperception Test). In some instances (Deisher et al., 1982; Fehrenbach et al., 1986; Shoor et al., 1966), court, medical, and other records were used as an adjunct to the interview data.

In most cases, the five methodological issues noted above (small n, nonrepresentative samples, retrospective data, mixed subtype confounds, and biased data gathering techniques) are probably a function of both the sensitive nature of the research topic and the relatively short period of time this topic has been considered worthy of study. Individually then, these studies are of highly variable validity. Furthermore, an integrative review of the findings of this research domain, one which could detect consistencies across studies with different strengths and weaknesses, has yet to be conducted.

Intervention Ambiguity

The conceptual and methodological deficiencies noted above bring into question the basis for selecting specific intervention procedures, with regard to addressing relevant treatment needs, and thereby raise concerns as to the effectiveness of intervention programs in general.

Olsen, Russell, and Sprenkle (1980) indicated that typologies bridge the gap between research and application by facilitating an empirical understanding of variables (etiologial and otherwise) and their unique relationships

to each "type." Hence, the value of typologies is in their ability to more clearly and concisely conceptualize the theoretical relationships of specific variables to the phenomenon under investigation. When the phenomenon being investigated is a physical or mental disorder, this understanding can be used to develop theoretically based intervention and/or prevention procedures that directly target relevant variables. Such procedures are likely to be more effective and less costly than the shotgun approach in that they address the issues necessary to positive outcome without wasted energy and time spent on extraneous tasks. In the case of youth sex offenders, these typologies are lacking, hence the uncertainty over what constitutes the conditions both necessary and sufficient for effective intervention.

Narrative Reviews of the Literature

An exhaustive review of the literature reveals that no meta-analytic examinations of existing empirical studies describing the characteristics of youthful sexual offenders and their offenses have been conducted to date. However, a number of limited narrative reviews have been conducted (e.g., Davis & Leitenberg, 1987; Quinsey, 1977; Saunders & Awad, 1988).

In 1987, Davis and Leitenberg conducted what remains perhaps the most thorough and frequently cited review to

date. However, after detailing nearly seven pages of offense and offender characteristics, the authors conceded:

Perhaps the most important conclusion we can draw from this review is that research on adolescent sex offenders, their offenses and their victims is still in an early stage. (p. 425)

Davis and Leitenberg (1987) noted that the only factors that can be associated with adolescent sex offending--with even a minimal degree of certainty--are a previous history of physical, and possibly sexual, victimization and prior behavioral and/or school disturbances. The authors are very critical of the empirical support for conceptualizing the juvenile sex offender based upon any characteristics, despite a host of variables having been clinically implicated (e.g., insecurities concerning sexual identity, fears about rejection, social skills deficit and social isolation, hostility towards women, stereotyped sex role attitudes, atypical masturbatory fantasies, antisocial personality traits, etc.) (See Table 18 in Appendix B for a summary of review findings.) Further, investigations of within-group differences for adolescent sex offenders as well as empirically sound comparisons between sex offenders and other delinquents and nondelinquent groups are virtually nonexistent.

Quinsey's (1977) review of assessment and treatment of adult offenders noted that child molesters exhibit "obvious" social behavior deficits, and are at greater risk of recidivism when the perpetrator began his sexually offending

career during adolescence or earlier. Unfortunately, no research is cited supporting either of these statements. Saunders and Awad (1988) suggested that the backgrounds of adolescent sexual offenders are similar to the backgrounds of other groups of juvenile delinquents. Most of the support for this notion is obtained from a subset of the same studies cited in the far more extensive Davis and Leitenberg (1987) review; however, Saunders and Awad (1988) appear considerably more convinced by existing data, an outcome perhaps due to the more limited selection of studies they reviewed.

A selection of existing empirical research on the characteristics of youthful sexual offenders and a review of existing narrative reviews suggest that there is little support for conceptualizing youthful sexual offenders either as a group, or by subgroups, on any particular dimension(s). However, while empirical research has continued, no major review has been conducted in the last 5 years. Furthermore, an integrative, meta-analytic review has yet to be undertaken. At present then, an opportunity exists to contribute to existing research on the characteristics of youthful sex offenders by meta-analytic examination of existing empirical research.

Research Integration: The Meta-Analytic Method

Gene Glass is probably most credited with the

development of the meta-analytic method. Glass (1976) has referred to meta-analysis as the ". . . statistical analysis of a large collection of analysis results from individual studies for the purpose of integrating the findings" (p. 3). However, he does not necessarily espouse specific techniques of analysis, but rather an attitude toward the data:

The approach to research integration referred to as "Meta-analysis" is nothing more than the attitude of data analysis applied to quantitative summaries of individual experiments. By recording the properties of studies and their findings in quantitative terms the meta-analysis of research invites one who would integrate numerous and diverse findings to apply the full power of statistical methods to the task. Thus, it is not a technique; rather it is a perspective that uses many techniques of measurement and statistical analysis. (Glass, McGraw, & Smith, 1981, p.21)

Glass (1977) typically utilized the metric referred to as the mean difference effect size calculated as the mean of the experimental group minus the mean of the control group divided by the standard deviation of the control group ($X_e - X_c / S_c$). Various modifications of the formula are possible such as using an averaged standard deviation. In addition, effect size can be calculated from other summary statistics such as t-scores, F-ratios, et cetera.

Mean difference effect size is not the only common metric used in meta-analysis. In fact, almost any statistic can be used as long as it allows a way of statistically summarizing diverse research. Furthermore, Bangert-Downs (1986) described both modifications of, and alternatives to, the Glassian approach to meta-analysis: study effect meta-

analysis, combined probability method, approximate data pooling with tests of homogeneity, and approximate data pooling with sampling error correction.

The approach used in this study needed to meet two criteria. First, the degree to which given typological variables applied to the youth sex offenders in general, and each of the various subgroups had to be determined. Degree refers to a quantitative measure of the extent a given variable is reported in a particular sample. Secondly, significant differences between the subgroups of offenders were assessed, as well as significant differences within groups and subgroups on exhaustive variables (i.e., subvariables that when totaled should exhaust the possibilities for a higher level variable; e.g., see Family Type, Ethnicity or SES in Appendix C). To this end, percentages were calculated for each variable and/or subvariable rather than mean difference effect size or a similar common metric. This allowed the degree to which a particular variable applied to be ascertained (e.g., percentage of rapists from upper SES), as well as whether significant differences existed between groups for a given variable. The methodology section elaborates how this was achieved.

CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

The data analyzed in this study were obtained from an extensive data set compiled by the Sex Offenses Research Team (SORT), led by Dr. D. Kim Openshaw at Utah State University, Logan, Utah. Computer-assisted and manual searches of psychology abstracts, dissertation abstracts, reviews of studies reported in books, and conference presentations, as well as professional correspondence, were conducted to obtain--as near as possible--the universe of research related to juvenile sexual offending. Reference sections from each source also contributed greatly to the pool of available data. Research through December of 1992 was examined for inclusion.

Sample Inclusion Criteria

Because existing empirical research examining youthful female sexual offending is in its infancy, only data for male offenders were analyzed in this project. To be included in this analysis, the following five criteria had to be met:

1. Each article or study must have had at least one sample of either youth or adult sex offenders (may have more).
2. If the sample was adult, then there must have been retrospective accounts of relevant historical data

from the sample subject's preadult life.

3. If the sample was preadult, then descriptive information for at least one relevant variable must have been provided.
4. Unless the study was considered in the literature as "landmark," it must have been dated 1980 or later.
5. To avoid sample duplication, samples from secondary analyses were omitted.

Once data from the available samples were coded, an ASCII format data file was created to expedite computer-assisted analysis. Various members of the SORT team were involved in the data entry process. To ensure accuracy of the coding and data entry procedure, interrater reliability coefficients were calculated.

The Coding Sheet

Samples were not limited to those studies that had as their focus the empirical examination of one or more variables of interest. Indeed, the focus was on the descriptions of the study samples which greatly increased the available data pool. Each sample was entered on a coding sheet according to year of publication, total n, subtype code (e.g., sexual assault or rapist, exhibitionism, etc.), subtype n, and quality of data. (See Appendix C for a reproduction of the coding sheet.)

The coding sheet was large and detailed, containing nearly 300 objective variables, and three sets of subjective variables. The need for such an extensive coding sheet was due to the lack of focus and coordination of the research base itself. The goal was to collect as much information as possible relevant to conceptualizing the juvenile sex offender. To insure important details were not missed, many variables were broken down into micro levels that could then be combined into more macro variables.

The percentage of each sample that met a given variable or criterion (for example, percent from single parent families) was the common metric. Means, standard deviations, and the number of studies reporting on each variable were obtained for the total sample of juvenile sex offenders, and each subtype (sexual assault offenders or rapists, pedophilic offenders, exhibitionists, voyeurs, multiple offense-type offenders). Appendix A provides operational definitions for each of the subtypes of youth sex offenders.

Quality of sample was recorded as 1 (good), 2 (average), or 3 (poor). A 1 (good) identified studies that (a) had random or quasi-random sampling from clearly defined "pools" of subjects (frequently excluding captive groups such as those obtained from prisons), and (b) used relatively objective means (e.g., standardized instruments, court records, investigative reports, medical records,

and/or self-reports confirmed by additional evidence) to obtain data for the variables of interest. Single subject case studies that clearly define offense history and meet the second criterion were also coded as 1. A 2 (average) was assigned to samples that met one of the above criteria and a 3 (poor) to studies meeting neither of the above criteria. The quality of empirical studies that specifically address one or more of the variables investigated here were judged on the same standards as that of studies investigating some other issue (e.g., treatment effects) that provided the necessary sample descriptions to be included in this project.

Coding Subjective Variables

There were seven major categories of variables: demographics, medical/psychiatric history, family, academic, interpersonal relationship, offender victimization history, sexual history, and criminal history, as well as over 80 variables and nearly 300 individual subvariables. These variables were selected from a variety of sources, including reviews of the relevant literature, selected empirical research of youthful sex offenders, and the developmental literature for nondelinquent youth.

Nearly all the variables were objective in the sense that the coder simply searched the study to determine if the original researchers reported on it, and then copied their

findings on the coding sheet in the appropriate location. However, an attempt was made to identify two offender variables, and one sample feature, through subjective coder ratings. The offender variables were family interaction style, and characterological orientation, and the sample variable was sample quality. These variables are subjective in the sense that the coder was required to identify certain key words and phrases, record their frequency of occurrence, and then determine if coding requirements were met.

Family interaction style examines how families interact with each other in terms of the Olsen et al. (1980) two-dimensional model. According to this model, family interaction is a function of both adaptability and cohesion with the polar extremes of both dimensions being pathological. For adaptability the extreme poles represent chaos on one end, and rigidity on the other, with healthy family adaptability centered on moderate degrees of flexibility and structure. For cohesion, the polar extremes are disengagement and enmeshment with healthy functioning centered on a balance of separation and connectedness. Hence, key words and phrases definitionally or contextually related to chaos, rigidity, flexibility, and structure (adaptability), and disengagement, enmeshment, separation, and connectedness (cohesion) were used as the coding criteria.

Characterological orientation was coded according to

DSM-III-R criteria for histrionic, narcissistic, borderline, and antisocial personality disorders. Therefore, coding criteria included key words and phrases synonymous with, or similar to, the diagnostic features of each disorder. However, they are characterological "orientations" or "traits" in that they cannot be diagnosed in children or adolescents.

Sample quality, defined above, was the only subjective variable concerning sample features. It was hypothesized that this variable might have considerable impact on the final results of the study. Hence, for this variable, key terms and phrases were explicitly defined, and approximately 16 hours of individual training--including three review meetings--were required prior to the actual data coding.

Analysis Procedures

Descriptive Analysis

Descriptive analysis was conducted using the number of samples reporting as *n*. Using this procedure, rather than pooling sample subjects, allowed variation between studies to be determined (in the form of standard deviations) and eliminated the potential of small sample findings being "washed-out" in the pooling process (Graves, 1992). Two draw-backs with this procedure are that because samples will frequently contribute to fewer than the total number of variables in an exhaustive class, sums will rarely add to

exactly 100%. Furthermore, each sample had identical "weight" in calculating mean percentages regardless of the number of subjects in the study. These problems were considered relatively minor given the risk of losing information by pooling subjects, the relative importance of findings for individual variables exceeding that for category sums, and data quality as an issue of sample selection and data gathering techniques to a greater degree than sample size.

Means, standard deviations, and n-sizes were reported for all variables receiving two or more entries ($n \geq 2$) where neither is a single subject case study, or three or more ($n \geq 3$) where single subject case studies comprise either part or all of the n for the given variable. At this point, similarly defined micro-level variables were combined to form broader macro-level variables that met the minimum n requirement for reporting.

The initial descriptive analysis included samples from all three quality categories. A second descriptive analysis was conducted to assess whether differences arise for variable means and standard deviations when the poorest quality samples (quality 3) are not included in the analysis. Variables selected for this analysis were those where at least six samples are reported ($n = 6$) in the initial (quality 1, 2 and 3 combined) descriptive analysis.

Requirements for reporting were identical to those described above.

Inferential Analysis

Inferential analysis included quality 1-3 data. Between-group comparisons (one- and two-way ANOVAs), where made, allowed significance to be assessed for mean percentage differences between the subtypes of sex offenders on selected variables. Two-way analyses examined main effects for both offender subtype and quality. Between-group comparisons on variables were made where data were fairly extensive on a given variable or less extensive but where the data were relatively consistent. These criteria were operationalized as: (a) the groups compared must each have had an n of at least six, and/or (b) the groups compared must each have had an n of at least four with a standard deviation no larger than 25% of the mean.

Within-group comparisons were made on exhaustive variables where (a) n equaled at least six data entries per variables, and/or (b) where n equaled at least four with a standard deviation of no larger than 25% of the mean. Exhaustive variables were those where subvariable data were mutually exclusive and comprise (to a reasonable degree) the universe of potential coding options. For example, the variable family type was exhaustive in that--at that time the original data were obtained--living with biological parents, a blended family, a single parent, or in foster

care [other] constituted all potential coding options. It is acknowledged that family type may change over time, and in rare cases an individual may spend half his/her time in a blended family and half with a single parent. However, for family type and the other exhaustive variables, limitations in the original data precluded attempting to make such fine discriminations.

When appropriate, analysis of covariance procedures were utilized to examine the effects of sample quality on the between-group findings for selected variables. Criterion for covariance analysis is operationalized as where n equals at least six samples per group compared. Because of limitations on how the data file could be manipulated, ANCOVA was not performed on within-group comparisons.

CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

Three caveats are warranted concerning the results of this study. The first has to do with statistical phenomenon related to summing over samples. As a reminder, apparently exhaustive categories (e.g., family type) will not necessarily sum to 100%. They may either exceed or sum to less than 100%. Each variable or subvariable percentage represents the average of the sample means--only for those samples reporting on the particular item. Hence, the reader should be concerned with individual variable or subvariable findings--not class sums.

The second caveat has to do with the definitions for the variables examined. Unfortunately, many of the studies analyzed used terms that were ambiguously defined, or not defined at all. This was dealt with in a straightforward manner. When a study provided data on a variable of interest (e.g., social isolation), but failed to define it, the variable was automatically coded on the coding form under the matching variable and entered on the data set. When the term was defined, a check was made to insure it was consistent with how other studies defined that term. If there were inconsistencies, then regardless of the original researcher's terminology, the data were placed under a matching variable consistent with the original researcher's definition--not always consistent with their variable term.

In some cases, ambiguity in the definition necessitated the data be omitted.

Unfortunately, it appears to be the rule, rather than the exception, that terms such as social skills deficit, social isolation, alcohol abuse, drug abuse, mental illness, sexual trauma, and so forth are not operationally defined in the research on youth sexual offending. What definitions are provided are briefly summarized in the results section, following each subheading, to assist the reader in understanding what is meant by the particular variable.

The third, and perhaps most important, caveat is that concerning "significance." For comparison purposes, statistical significance was assessed via ANOVA and ANCOVA procedures (ANCOVA only in between subgroup comparisons). However, statistical significance, while a very important concept, may be only weakly related to clinical significance. For example, each of the three main subgroups of offenders may exhibit a high frequency of some characteristic or behavior (e.g., history of impulsivity), but not differ significantly from one another. Such a finding would be of paramount clinical significance--even if the subgroup means failed to differ statistically from each other. Therefore, outcome percentages for particular variables and subvariables should be interpreted as to whether or not they represent possible important antecedent characteristics and/or treatment concerns, at least as much

as whether or not they differ "significantly" between subgroups, thereby contributing to individual typologies.

Interrater Reliability

Objective Variables

Reliability between coders was expected to be quite high as the majority of the variables coded were highly objective and simply required the coder to copy percentages directly from the sample description to the coding form, or at most required calculating percentages from data provided on n and sub-n sizes (e.g., calculating percentages by dividing a sub-n by the total n). Cohen's Kappa (Bakeman & Gottman, 1989), was calculated on a randomly selected third of the objective variables (n=10) and five predetermined variables (subgroup classification, family type, ethnicity, social skills deficit, sexual abuse [offender victim]). Kappa is the preferred statistic here since kappa controls for chance agreement between raters, as well as taking into consideration how close near misses are on codings (Bakeman & Gottman, 1989).

In all cases, kappa was computed on at least three sample pairs and then averaged. Table 19 in Appendix D lists the findings of this analysis for each of variables examined. For the objective variables, kappa ranged from .84 (referral source) to 1.00 (ethnicity), with a mean overall reliability of .91.

Subjective Variables

Three subjective variables were coded in an attempt to tease out information not readily apparent from the sample descriptions. These variables were "subjective" in that they required the coder to assess from the language of the text whether or not some portion of a sample met predetermined coding requirements for particular variables (i.e., sample quality, family interaction style, and characterological orientation/ traits). Generally, this required the coder to search for key words and phrases and then sum the "hits" to determine if coding requirements were met.

For the subjective variables, reliability was somewhat lower. Kappa for sample quality was .81, family interaction style was .73, and characterological orientation/traits was .70.

Given fairly extensive coder training, kappa for sample quality was somewhat lower than expected; however, it should be noted that no differences in quality coded were greater than one (between quality 1 and 2 or 2 and 3), and in 80% of the cases the disagreement was between a quality 1 and quality 2 designation, which for descriptive procedures were combined anyway. Therefore, the potentially negative impact of the modest reliability for sample quality is perhaps less than might be interpreted from the kappa statistics.

Descriptive And Inferential Analysis
for Quality 1 - 3 Samples

One-hundred forty samples comprising a total of 16,114 individual subjects were analyzed in this study (see Appendix F for a listing of these study samples). The average sample was composed of 115 subjects (SD 117, range 1 to 561) met quality 2 criteria (mean 1.8, SD .74) and was obtained from a study dated in the mid 1980s (mean = 1986, SD = 3.9 years). Due to a paucity of research on youthful voyeurs and exhibitionists (no variables met reporting criteria), individual subtype data are reported for sexual assault, pedophilic, and mixed offense (offenders who commit more than one type of sexual offense, e.g., pedophilic and sexual assault and/or unspecified offenses) offenders.

The following tables summarize the descriptive findings for these three groups individually, and all five groups combined. Results from inferential analyses are provided and discussed where data met the predetermined criteria for conducting the ANOVA and ANCOVA procedures.

Demographic Characteristics

Six variables make up the demographic characteristics that met coding requirements. They are summarized in Table 2 and include family type, ethnicity, socioeconomic status (SES), referral source, offender education level, and religious affiliation.

Table 2

General Demographic Characteristics for Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Family Type:				
Biological	46 (26, 03)	39 (32, 07)	36 (15, 16)	38 (21, 26)
Blended	n/a	24 (07, 03)	20 (13, 06)	21 (11, 09)
Single	78 (14, 04)	44 (22, 07)	37 (20, 15)	45 (24, 26)
Foster (Other)	28 (04, 02)	53 (45, 05)	29 (28, 17)	34 (31, 24)
Ethnicity:				
Caucasian	60 (32, 15)	59 (36, 11)	59 (32, 36)	59 (32, 64)
Black	34 (22, 14)	41 (28, 10)	37 (27, 25)	37 (25, 51)
Hispanic	17 (12, 07)	21 (08, 06)	18 (12, 14)	18 (11, 29)
Oriental	n/a	n/a	1 (01, 05)	1 (01, 06)
Native American	n/a	n/a	2 (01, 04)	2 (01, 06)
Mixed (Other)	n/a	5 (05, 02)	24 (32, 19)	22 (30, 22)
SES/Income:				
Upper (\$60,000+)	12 (01, 02)	n/a	10 (07, 02)	9 (05, 05)
Middle (\$15,000-59,000)	38 (28, 03)	49 (22, 03)	44 (35, 07)	44 (29, 13)
Lower (<\$15,000)	45 (32, 02)	51 (23, 03)	61 (26, 05)	59 (26, 11)

(table continues)

Variable	Type of Offender				
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined	
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	
Referral Source:					
Self	52 (41, 03)	n/a	68 (54, 03)	65 (43, 07)	
Probation/Parole	15 (11, 03)	57 (39, 05)	26 (12, 02)	38 (34, 10)	
Lawyer	n/a	n/a	15 (11, 04)	17 (10, 05)	
Clinician	n/a	83 (40, 06)	76 (38, 14)	81 (35, 23)	
Family Member	n/a	n/a	9 (03, 03)	31 (45, 04)	
Child Protection	n/a	17 (06, 02)	52 (41, 08)	40 (37, 12)	
Juvenile Court	72 (40, 06)	80 (33, 03)	63 (35, 12)	69 (35, 22)	
Other	65 (47, 05)	72 (36, 06)	57 (39, 15)	62 (38, 26)	
Education Level:					
</= 6th Grade	34 (29, 02)	n/a	16 (15, 02)	36 (35, 06)	
</= 9th Grade	46 (29, 07)	63 (34, 05)	70 (51, 03)	56 (34, 14)	
High School Grad.	33 (19, 05)	n/a	73 (35, 04)	51 (31, 10)	
</= 2 yrs College	22 (14, 02)	n/a	30 (19, 04)	27 (15, 07)	
4 yr College Grad.	12 (03, 04)	15 (01, 02)	31 (26, 02)	17 (13, 08)	
Graduate School	n/a	n/a	n/a	32 (45, 04)	
Religion:					
Catholic	n/a	n/a	n/a	38 (04, 02)	
Protestant (other)	n/a	n/a	n/a	62 (36, 03)	

Note. Post-high school education data are entirely derived from adult retrospective accounts.

Family type. Four forms of parent-child family structure are reported under the main variable family type: biological (intact family with biological parents), blended (the offender has one step parent and may have step brothers and sisters), single (offender lives with one biological parent), and foster or other (includes offenders living in unrelated foster families, or other situations such as with an older sibling or extended family member, etc.).

A result that is immediately noticeable for family type is the high percentage of sexual assault offenders from single parent families. Of the four studies that provide such data, an average of 78% of subjects was described as living with only one parent (nearly always the mother), versus 44% for pedophilic offenders ($SD = 22$, $n = 7$), and 37% ($SD = 20$, $n = 15$) for mixed offense offenders.

Between group comparisons (offender subtype) show that sexual assault offenders were more likely to come from single parent families than either the pedophilic or mixed offense offenders, $F(2, 25) = 6.29$, $p=.008$. Quality of sample did not have a significant main effect in a 2-way model, $F(2, 25) = 1.1$, $p=.361$. Further, there was no significant interaction between offender subtype and quality of sample, $F(3, 25) = 2.2$, $p=.12$, nor did quality have an influence when it was examined as a covariate, $F(1, 25) = 2.72$, $p=.11$. ANCOVA results also confirmed the main effect for offender subgroups with sexual assault offenders more

likely to come from single parent families than either of the other two offender subgroups, $F(2, 25) = 5.47$, $p=.01$.

Comparisons of family types among sexual assault offenders found that this subtype of offender was significantly more likely to come from single parent families than from foster (other) families (mean = 28%), $F(2, 8) = 5.71$, $p=.04$, with no significant difference between biological/intact families (mean = 46%) and either of the other two reported family types.

Except for single parent, there were no significant differences either between the subtypes of offenders on the various family types, or within the three subgroups of offenders on family types. This may have been due to the frequently high standard deviations that can be observed in the table. In turn, this variability may reflect a wide diversity in the kinds of families from which youth sex offenders come. However, pedophilic youth were reported as living in foster (other) families the most (mean = 53, SD = 45, $n = 5$), at least at the time of intervention, and blended families (mean = 24%, SD = 07, $n = 03$) the least. For mixed offense offenders, biological/intact families and single parent families were the most common (mean = 36, SD = 15, $n = 16$, and 37%, SD = 20, $n = 15$, respectively) and blended families the least common (mean = 20%, SD = 13, $n = 6$).

Ethnicity. Five ethnic/racial groups--Caucasian,

Black, Hispanic, Oriental, Native American--and a mixed (other) group are described. For every type of youth offender, Caucasians made up the majority of the averaged samples, sexual assault = 60%, pedophilic = 59%, and mixed offense offenders = 59%. Despite large standard deviations, sexual assault offenders were significantly more likely to be Caucasian than either Black or Hispanic, $F(2, 35) = 8.12$, $p = .001$, pedophilic offenders were significantly more likely to be Caucasian than Hispanic $F(2, 26) = 3.36$, $p = .05$, and mixed offense sex offenders were significantly more likely to be Caucasian than Black or Hispanic and more likely to be Black than Hispanic, $F(2, 73) = 12.48$, $p < .001$. There were no differences in the percentages of Black offenders among the subgroups, $F(2, 48) = .15$, $p > .86$. These findings, in general, are consistent with the ethnic diversity of the United States with no individual racial group appearing to have been over- or underrepresented in any particular offense category.

Socioeconomic status (SES). As noted in the demographics table, youth sex offenders in the samples were predominantly from middle (\$15,000-59,000) and lower (<\$15,000) SES families with little difference between the two SES levels within either the sexual assault or pedophilic offender groups. The mixed offense offenders were to a greater extent from lower SES. No inferential tests were run as n sizes were too small; hence, caution is

warranted in generalizing beyond the samples.

Referral source. Youth sex offenders were referred for services from a variety of sources. Those examined here include: the offender himself (nearly always following victim disclosure and usually mandates by parents or other authorities, also includes adult samples who self-refer and then provided retrospective data), juvenile probation/parole, lawyers, clinicians, other family members, child protective services, juvenile courts, and "other" sources. The findings appear somewhat ambiguous in that many of the reported percentages were quite high, indicating that different study samples were referred by entirely different sources, and in some cases, subjects were referred by more than one source. For example, the 12 mixed offense offender samples that contributed to the percentage referred by clinicians are not part of the 14 samples referred from juvenile court. In other cases, probation/parole and juvenile court referrals overlap.

Perhaps more important are the missing data. Referral by self (despite the noted coercion from others) was fairly common to sexual assault and mixed offense offenders, but no data were available for pedophilic offenders. Similarly, pedophilic and mixed offense offenders were commonly referred by clinicians, but the same does not appear to be the case for sexual assault offenders. Although this could be a result of researchers failing to ask all relevant

referral questions (data deficit), it could also be a result of the social stigma attached to the molestation of persons significantly younger than oneself (hence pedophilic offenders do not self-refer), and resistance to mental/physical health care services by sexual assault offenders (they simply do not see clinicians) unless coerced.

Education level. Data on the offender's level of education were gathered as part of an overall look at offender intellectual competence. However, because individual subject data are almost never provided, the results are confounded by the different ages of the study samples. For example, it is doubtful that any members of a sample between the ages of 10 and 14 years will be high school graduates. Furthermore, data on post-high school education was obtained entirely from adult retrospective accounts. It does appear, however, that youth sex offenders, as a group, achieve all levels of education.

Religion. Information concerning religiosity was obtained for a variety of affiliations. However, a lack of data necessitated combining data into two main groups: Catholic and Protestant (non-Catholic) and averaged for the combined offenders group only. Nonaffiliated offenders are not included. Thirty-eight percent of the youth offenders indicated that they were Catholic and 62% were not. Given the religious breakdown of the United States, it appears

that youth sex offenders are a religiously diverse group.

Parental and Family Characteristics

Table 3 describes the parental and family characteristics of youth sexual offenders. Variables include parental alcohol and drug abuse, history of parental mental illness, parental history of child neglect, physical abuse and sexual abuse, parental history of victimization (neglect, physical, and sexual abuse) as children, and family interaction style.

Parental alcohol abuse. The first entry in Table 3 deals with parental abuse of alcohol. This variable was defined by individual study samples. It generally required that the parent has either sought treatment for excessive alcohol use, or is frequently unable to function in the role of parent due to intoxication. Maternal alcohol abuse appears to be a commonly reported phenomenon for pedophilic and mixed offense offenders and paternal abuse of alcohol a problem for sexual assault offenders. The highest rate (an average of 62% of subjects) was seen in the five reporting pedophilic samples for fathers (biological or step). However, the standard deviation is very high (34), indicating that there was considerable variability between the samples. The lowest paternal rate was 46% as evidenced by four mixed offense samples.

Fathers are not the only parent abusing alcohol, at least for the pedophilic and mixed offense offenders. For

Table 3

Parental and Family Characteristics for Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault Mean% (SD, n)	Pedophilic Mean% (SD, n)	Mixed Offense Mean% (SD, n)	Combined Mean% (SD, n)
Alcohol Abuse:				
Maternal	17 (04, 03)	43 (34, 06)	39 (35, 05)	36 (31, 14)
Paternal	53 (04, 02)	62 (34, 05)	46 (09, 04)	55 (23, 11)
Drug Abuse:				
Maternal	25 (07, 02)	39 (29, 03)	51 (31, 06)	43 (27, 11)
Paternal	n/a	66 (09, 02)	n/a	62 (09, 03)
Mental Illness:				
Maternal	n/a	29 (13, 02)	13 (11, 03)	20 (12, 06)
Paternal	n/a	18 (02, 02)	5 (01, 02)	12 (07, 05)
History of Child Neglect:				
Maternal	n/a	n/a	55 (08, 03)	44 (22, 04)
Paternal	n/a	n/a	n/a	54 (43, 03)
History of Child Physical Abuse:				
Maternal	n/a	37 (05, 02)	n/a	52 (27, 05)
Paternal	33 (09, 03)	47 (30, 06)	23 (18, 05)	37 (24, 15)

(table continues)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
History of Child*				
Sexual Abuse:				
Maternal	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Paternal	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Maternal History of Childhood				
Victimization:				
Physical Abuse	37 (09, 02)	63 (22, 05)	37 (36, 05)	48 (29, 12)
Sexual Abuse	n/a	n/a	22 (14, 05)	24 (13, 06)
Paternal History of Childhood				
Victimization:				
Physical Abuse	n/a	n/a	n/a	32 (16, 02)
Sexual Abuse	n/a	n/a	8 (03, 02)	8 (03, 02)
Family Interaction Style (Adaptability):				
Flexible/Structured	n/a	n/a	42 (11, 04)	41 (10, 05)
Chaotic/Rigid	62 (43, 04)	89 (22, 05)	57 (33, 07)	68 (34, 16)

(table continues)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Family Interaction				
Style (Cohesion):				
Separated/ Connected	n/a	n/a	53 (28, 05)	46 (29, 07)
Disengaged/ Enmeshed	50 (49, 03)	89 (27, 05)	60 (22, 05)	68 (33, 13)

*See page 49 for an explanation of the n/a findings.

the six pedophilic offender samples that assessed mothers' abuse of alcohol, an average of 43% of subjects had mothers who were reportedly abusers of alcohol. For mixed offense offenders the rate was 39%. Again, however, there appears to be considerable variability (SDs = 34 and 35, respectively) between studies. For mothers of sexual assault offenders, the rate was considerably lower at an average of 17% (SD = 4).

Parental drug abuse. The definitions for drug abuse, when provided, include any use of illicit drugs and/or abuse of legal drugs. The limited data available tend to suggest that parental drug abuse was also fairly common in families with sexually offending youth. Fathers of pedophilic youth had the highest average rates (Mean = 66%, SD = 9), although there are only two samples reporting. Data were somewhat more extensive (although more variable) for maternal drug abuse where the rates ranged from 25% for mothers of sexual assault offenders to 51% for mothers of mixed offense offenders.

Mental illness. Those studies providing data on mental illness generally did not define specific disorders, but rather referred to a history of psychiatric problems requiring some form of intervention. Where a specific disorder was mentioned, it was almost always a depressive disorder.

Mental illness was reported in less than a third (29%)

of mothers with pedophilic youth, and 13% of mixed offense offenders. Fathers were less often reported as having a history of psychiatric illness, with 18% in the case of pedophilic youth, and 5% for mixed offense offenders. No data were available for parents of sexual assault offenders.

History of child neglect. This variable refers to a history of one or both of the parents exhibiting a consistent pattern of failing to meet the physical and/or emotional needs of one or more of their children--but not necessarily the child referred for sexual offending. Those data are provided in a later section. As noted in the parental and family characteristics table, data met reporting criteria only for mixed offense offenders where 55% of mothers (SD = 8) reported to have such a history. However, as evidenced by the combined group findings, youth sexual offenders appear to come from families where neglect was a common problem. Although variability is high, four samples reported an average of 44% (SD = 22) of mothers as being neglectful, and three samples reported 54% (SD = 43) of fathers as being neglectful.

History of child physical abuse. This variable refers to a history of one or both parents intentionally causing physical injury to one or more of their children--but not necessarily the child referred for sexually offending. Those data are provided in a later section. Data were more extensive for fathers on this variable. From 23% (mixed

offense offenders) to 47% (pedophilic offenders) of fathers reportedly had a history of being physically abusive to one or more of their children. Samples of sexual assault offenders reported an average of 33% of their fathers as having been physically abusive, and in this case the variability was quite small, perhaps suggesting that this is a more consistent phenomenon for this group.

Data for maternal perpetration of physical abuse were lacking; however, two samples reported that overall 37% (SD = 5) of pedophilic offenders note such a history in their families.

History of child sexual abuse. This variable refers to a history of one or both parents engaging in sexual contact (sexual arousal of self and/or the child is the intended goal) with one or more of their children--but not the child referred for sexually offending. Those data are provided in a later section. No data met reporting criteria for this variable. This finding was unexpected (hence, the exception to the reporting criteria). Because youth sexual offenders report being sexually victimized by parents or other family members (usually the father) at fairly high rates (see History of Childhood Victimization and Perpetrators in Youth Sex Offenders, page 68), it is likely that in some cases other children in the family are being sexually abused, also. Hence, the findings here probably represent a failure to ask the appropriate research questions, rather than an

accurate picture of sexual abuse in the offender's home.

Maternal history of childhood victimization. This variable originally examined whether the mothers of youth sex offenders have a history of being neglected, physically abused, or sexually abused as children. However, researchers have yet to address whether or not mothers of youth sexual offenders have a history of being neglected. As noted in Table 3, 37% of mothers of both sexual assault offenders and mixed offense offenders are reported as having a history of being physically abused while growing up. Fully 63% (SD = 22) of mothers of pedophilic youth reportedly have such a history.

An average of 22% of mothers in the reporting samples of mixed offense offenders had a history of being sexually abused as children. For all groups combined, 24% of subjects in the reporting samples indicated that the mothers of youth sexual offenders, in general, had a history of being sexually abused as children.

Paternal history of childhood victimization. This variable examines whether the fathers of youth sexual offenders have a history of being physically abused, or sexually abused as a child. Again no data met reporting criteria for neglect. Although there was a paucity of data, 8% of the fathers of mixed offense offenders reportedly had a history of being sexually abused as a child, and 32% of subjects in the combined group had a history of being

physically abused while growing up.

Family interaction style. This variable, the last of Table 3, is one of the three described earlier as being a fairly subjective determination of the coder. Furthermore, coders only rarely reported that samples provided data for coding on this variable. Therefore, the eight possible variables were collapsed into four: adaptability as generally healthy (flexible/structured) and pathological (chaotic/ rigid), and cohesion as generally healthy (separated/ connected) and pathological (disengaged/ enmeshed). Without a doubt, combining the polar extremes into "unhealthy" functioning categories sacrifices the richness of the model and muddles the picture in terms of how families are engaging in coping, boundary setting, and so forth. However, it does allow preliminary examination of whether and to what degree families of youth sexual offenders are engaging in problematic intrafamily relationships.

Immediately noticeable from Table 3 is that pathological family interaction appears to be the rule for all groups of youth sexual offenders. Concerning chaotic/rigid family adaptability, families of pedophilic youth appeared to have the most unhealthy families with an average of 89% (SD = 22) of subjects in five reporting samples meeting coding criteria. For families of youth sexual assault offenders, the rate was 62% (SD = 4) of

subjects in four reporting samples reportedly came from families that were chaotic or rigid in terms of adaptability. Families of mixed offense offenders had the lowest rate at 57% ($SD = 33$, $n = 7$). Although there were no significant differences between the means for the three subgroups of youth sex offenders in terms of adaptability, $F(2, 15) = 1.25$, $p = .34$, the indications are that serious family dysfunction was common to all groups.

Similar findings were noted for family cohesion. Again for families of pedophilic youth, an average of 89% ($SD = 27$) of five reporting samples met the coding criteria for pathological family cohesion. Families of mixed offense offenders exhibited the second highest rate with 60% ($SD = 22$) of five samples coded on the pathological end of the spectrum, and families of youth sexual assault offenders had the lowest rate with 50% ($SD = 49$, $n = 5$).

Only rarely were the healthy centers of the adaptability/cohesion dimensions of family interaction coded. However, as can be seen in the table, when they were, the results tended to be very consistent (sums approximate 100% given the fairly large standard deviations, unequal n 's, and moderate interrater reliability) with findings for the high prevalence of problematic family interaction styles.

Youth Sex Offender Medical/Psychiatric Histories

The medical/psychiatric histories of youth sexual offenders are described in Table 4. Variables summarized are medical history, characterological orientation/traits, DSM-III-R diagnoses (DSM-III for pre-1987 studies), and history of previous mental health treatment.

Medical history. Four subvariables met reporting criteria for medical history: enuresis (primarily nocturnal), head injury (trauma requiring medical intervention), blackouts (loss of conscious awareness), and unspecified disabilities. No data were reported for pedophilic youth. For sexual assault offenders, an average of 43% of the reporting samples indicated that these sex offenders had problems with bed wetting, and the standard deviation is small ($SD = 7$). Twenty-seven percent had history of some form of head injury, and 37% had reportedly experienced blackouts.

For mixed offense offenders, 25% of these youth have had difficulties with bed wetting, 26% head injuries (no data is available for blackouts), and 15% other, unspecified impairments. Except for enuresis in youth sexual assault offenders, the standard deviations are all moderate to large (51 to 127% of the mean).

Characterological orientation/traits. This variable is another of those noted earlier as coder subjective. Two

Table 4

Youth Sex Offender Medical/Psychiatric Histories (Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Medical History of:				
Enuresis	43 (07, 03)	n/a	25 (13, 04)	33 (14, 07)
Head Injury	27 (20, 03)	n/a	26 (33, 02)	36 (33, 07)
Blackouts	37 (19, 02)	n/a	n/a	33 (15, 03)
Unspecified Disability	n/a	n/a	15 (17, 03)	15 (17, 03)
Characterological Orientation/Traits:				
Borderline	9 (10, 02)	n/a	47 (39, 04)	48 (41, 08)
Antisocial	16 (13, 03)	n/a	35 (13, 04)	40 (34, 10)
DSM-III(-R) Diagnosis:				
Conduct Disorder	n/a	n/a	49 (14, 03)	49 (14, 03)
Unspecified Diagnosis	10 (06, 04)	36 (25, 02)	41 (11, 06)	33 (21, 13)
History of Psychological Intervention:				
Offense Related	38 (45, 03)	54 (43, 03)	57 (32, 04)	55 (37, 11)
Other	n/a	n/a	65 (23, 04)	49 (30, 06)

subvariables met coding criteria: the borderline and antisocial traits. These two traits are essentially the same as the personality disorders, by the same name, described in the DSM-III-R (APA, 1987) and DSM-III (APA, 1980) for pre-1987 studies. They are referred to here as orientations or "traits" as these disorders cannot be diagnosed in youth; however, important antecedents such as acting-out, and conduct disorder, impulsivity, and identity disorder can be diagnosed (APA, 1987).

No data met coding criteria for pedophilic youth offenders. For samples of youth sexual assault offenders, 9% of subjects met criteria for a borderline orientation, and 16% antisocial. Of mixed offense offenders, 47% met criteria for borderline, and 35% antisocial. Although the overall ratings for borderline, and especially antisocial orientations, were somewhat lower than expected for youth sexual assault offenders, for all groups combined, borderline and antisocial traits do appear fairly common (48% and 40%, respectively).

DSM-III-R diagnoses. This variable required that sample subjects meet criteria for diagnoses as outlined in the DSM-III-R (APA, 1987), or DSM-III (APA, 1980) for pre-1987 studies. Only conduct disorder met coding requirements as a specific diagnosis. Mixed (or unspecified) diagnoses are also included.

For mixed offense offenders, an average of 49% of

individuals in three reporting samples was diagnosed with conduct disorder. Somewhat surprisingly, the youth sexual assault offender group failed to meet coding criteria on this variable. However, this finding is unexpectedly consistent with the relatively low rates of antisocial traits for the same group noted earlier. Furthermore, the high reported rates of conduct disorder in mixed offense offenders is consistent with the high frequency of antisocial traits noted earlier. Whether this "anomaly" is a result of a deficit in the research base, or evidence that sexual assault in youth is not necessarily associated with conduct disorder, needs to be addressed.

History of psychological intervention. This variable examines whether, and to what degree, offender subgroups had a history of receiving psychological services. Services may be related to their sexual offense history--if the services were rendered for offenses other than those that have resulted in the present placement (sample). Hence, the "offense-related" subvariable represents one measure of posttreatment recidivism rates. Data are also presented for past psychological intervention unrelated to the youth's sexual offense. Table 4 summarizes these findings.

For the offense-related subvariable, data were fairly limited but represent a dramatic contradiction of the current estimates (e.g., 7-12%) of posttreatment recidivism. Of three samples reporting, an average of 38% (SD = 45) of

sexual assault offenders had received previous treatment for sexual offenses. The rates were even higher for pedophilic offenders where three samples report rates of 54% (SD = 43). Finally, mixed offense offenders report the highest rate of 57% and lowest standard deviation (SD = 32). Of course, these figures may represent inflated recidivism rates if one concludes that reoffending youth tend to get caught and receive treatment again (hence, they are returned to the treatment system). However, it is just as valid to argue that it represents an underestimate, given the evidence that offenders have a low rate of initial, as well as posttreatment apprehension, following the commission of sexual offenses.

Subgroup data were only available for mixed offense offenders for history of psychological intervention unrelated to the subjects' sexual offense. Sixty-five percent of these offenders, averaged over four reporting samples, had a history of receiving some form of past psychological intervention. For all subgroups combined, the rate was somewhat lower at 49%. In all cases the standard deviations for this variable were quite high, indicating wide variability between samples.

Youth Sex Offender Educational Histories

The educational histories of youth sexual offenders are summarized in Table 5 and includes extracurricular

Table 5

Youth Sex Offender Educational Histories (Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Extracurricular Activities:				
Sports	n/a	n/a	n/a	61 (38, 03)
Social Clubs	n/a	n/a	n/a	15 (06, 02)
Academic Problems:				
Retained (1+ Grades)	n/a	n/a	59 (14, 04)	52 (19, 05)
Learning Disabled	n/a	n/a	41 (18, 07)	43 (29, 09)
Remedial Intervention	n/a	n/a	53 (23, 04)	57 (25, 07)
Estimated IQ:				
</= 85	26 (19, 03)	25 (24, 04)	27 (08, 04)	26 (16, 11)
86-114	46 (10, 02)	82 (00, 02)	70 (20, 04)	67 (19, 08)
>/=115	n/a	n/a	12 (03, 02)	10 (04, 03)
Mean IQ	96 (04, 05)	99 (07, 05)	98 (07, 15)	98 (07, 25)

activities, academic problems, and estimated IQ.

Extracurricular activities. Participation in extracurricular sports (football, basketball, volleyball, etc.) and social clubs (includes glee clubs, band, academic clubs, and scouting) were the two subvariables coded here. As noted in Table 5, no subvariable data met coding criteria except for all subgroups of youth sex offenders combined. An average of 61% of subjects in three reporting samples participated in some form of extracurricular sports, and 15% of two samples in one or more social clubs.

Academic problems. Three types of academic problems were examined: being retained one or more grade levels, learning disabled, and/or problems that necessitated some form of remedial intervention. No data met coding criteria for either youth sexual assault offenders or pedophilic offenders.

For mixed offense offenders, an average of 59% (SD = 14) of subjects in the four reporting samples had a history of being retained, 41% (SD = 18) of seven samples were indicated as being learning disabled, and 53% (SD = 23) of four samples had received some form of remedial intervention during their academic careers. Rates were similar for all groups combined.

Estimated IQ. Table 5 describes the findings for this subvariable. IQ was examined from two perspectives, the percentage that fell within approximately one standard

deviation (15 points) of the population mean (100), as well as the percentages that fell either above or below those cutoffs, and the mean IQ for each of the three subgroups of offenders and the combined total.

What is immediately apparent, despite the limited data, is the relative normality in terms of estimated IQ. Slightly more sexual assault, pedophilic, and mixed offense offenders may have IQs below 85 (26, 25, and 27%, respectively) than the general population, but the difference is small, and mean IQ for each of the offender subgroups approximates 100.

Interpersonal Relationship

Characteristics

Data in Table 6 consist of four variables: social isolation from parents, social skills, social confidence, and social isolation from peers.

Social isolation from parents. Offender isolation from mothers and fathers was coded. This subvariable refers to an unavailability for guidance, monitoring, and feedback from the offender's parent(s). As noted in Table 6, an average of 62% of subjects in three reporting samples of youth sexual assault offenders were suggested to be socially isolated from their mothers. Data did not meet coding criteria for pedophilic and mixed offense youth. However, for all groups combined, 58% of youth sexual offenders from five samples were reportedly isolated from their mothers.

Table 6

Youth Sex Offender Interpersonal Relationship Characteristics (Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault Mean% (SD, n)	Pedophilic Mean% (SD, n)	Mixed Offense Mean% (SD, n)	Combined Mean% (SD, n)
<hr/>				
Social Isolation From:				
Mother	62 (30, 03)	n/a	n/a	58 (31, 05)
Father	n/a	44 (60, 02)	61 (19, 03)	65 (34, 07)
Lacks Social Skills With:				
Female Peers	27 (12, 03)	76 (40, 03)	61 (31, 11)	60 (33, 18)
Male Peers	21 (15, 03)	58 (49, 04)	55 (28, 11)	53 (34, 19)
Lacks Social Confidence With:				
Female Peers	n/a	n/a	87 (25, 04)	80 (35, 07)
Male Peers	n/a	99 (00, 03)	87 (25, 04)	92 (18, 07)
Social Isolation From:				
Female Peers	23 (13, 02)	92 (13, 07)	65 (24, 09)	72 (28, 18)
Male Peers	23 (13, 02)	92 (13, 07)	69 (21, 10)	70 (27, 19)

Data for social isolation from fathers were not available for youth sexual assault offenders. Forty-four percent ($SD = 60$) of subjects averaged over two reporting pedophilic offender samples, and 61% ($SD = 19$) from three samples of reporting mixed offense offenders were indicated as having been socially isolated from their fathers.

Social skills deficit. Social skills are defined here as the repertoire of behaviors necessary for appropriate social interaction. It does not refer to the opportunity or motivation to utilize those skills in social situations. The subvariable examines offender lack of social skills in interactions with female and male peers.

Pedophilic youth exhibited the greatest lack of social skills with both female and male peers. Seventy-six percent ($SD = 40$) of subjects averaged over three samples reportedly lack social skill with female peers. Fifty-eight percent ($SD = 49$) from four samples lack the same with male peers. Mixed offense offenders were only slightly less likely to exhibit a deficit in social skills with peers. Fully 61% ($SD = 31$) from 11 samples lack the social skills necessary for appropriate social interactions with female peers. For male peers, an average of 55% ($SD = 28$) from 11 samples exhibited the same. There was no significant difference between lack of social skills for female and male peers among mixed offense offenders, $F(1, 21) = .18, p=.68$.

Youth sexual assault offenders exhibited the lowest

social skills deficit with an average of 27% (SD = 12) of three samples lacking social skills in interactions with female peers, and 21% (SD = 15) of three samples lacking the same with male peers.

Social confidence. Social confidence refers to one's motivation to interact socially with peers. For three samples of pedophilic youth, all subjects (SD = 0) lacked motivation to engage in social interaction with peers of the same sex. No data were available for female peers.

The four samples coded for mixed offense offenders did not clearly differentiate between male and female peers. However, for both sexes, an average of 87% (SD = 25) of subjects from four samples reportedly lacked the confidence and motivation to engage in social interaction with peers.

For all groups combined, a lack of social confidence appears common concerning peer interactions. Eighty percent of subjects averaged over seven samples indicated that they were apprehensive engaging in social interaction with female peers, and fully 92% felt the same way about their male peers. Specific data was unavailable for sexually assaultive youth.

Social isolation from peers. This subvariable refers to avoiding of, or withdrawing from, opportunity for social interaction. It was coded for female and male peers. Pedophilic youth immediately stand out as being socially isolated. Although sample data were not subdivided by sex

for this group, an average of 92% (SD = 13) of offenders in seven samples reported being socially isolated from peers. Sexual assault offenders exhibited the lowest rates. Again, the two reporting samples did not differentiate by sex of peer, but overall, 23% (SD = 13) of these groups were identified as socially isolated from peers.

Mixed offense offenders fall in the middle with 65% (SD = 24) of 9 samples reportedly isolated from female peers, and 65% (SD = 21) of 10 samples isolated from male peers. A one-way ANOVA did not yield a significant difference between social isolation for male peers and female peers for mixed offense offenders, $F(1, 18) = .13, p > .72$.

As seen in Table 6, for all groups combined the rates of social isolation were high. Seventy-two percent of subjects averaged from 18 samples were reportedly isolated from female peers, and 70% from 19 samples isolated from male peers. These rates are high considering they include the relatively low rates for sexual assault offenders.

Analysis of variance procedures demonstrated that pedophilic youth were significantly more likely to be socially isolated from female peers than were sexual assault offenders, $F(2, 17) = 13.52, p = .001$. Furthermore, quality of sample was not an influence in the results either as a main effect, $F(2, 17) = 2.18, p = .16$, or as a covariate, $F(1, 17) = .39, p = .54$. ANOVA tests resulted in almost identical findings for isolation from same sex peers. Pedophilic

youth were significantly more likely to be socially isolated from male peers than were sexual assaultive youth, $F(2, 18) = 15.84$, $p=.001$. Again, quality was neither an influence when examined as a main effect, $F(2, 18) = 1.73$, $p=.22$, nor a covariate, $F(1, 18) = .67$, $p=.43$.

General Behavioral

Interaction Characteristics

General behavioral interaction characteristics refer here to behaviors generally associated with patterns of maladaptive social interactions across situations. Five subvariables are coded under two major variables: general affective (hostility, impulsivity, and social anxiety) and general cognitive (uncooperative, low achievement). Table 7 summarizes the findings.

General affective. No data were available on youth sexual assault offenders for hostility or social anxiety. For impulsivity, 37% of this subgroup ($SD = 32$) were reported as behaving impulsively--that is, not considering, or being concerned with--possible consequences prior to acting-out.

For pedophilic offenders, an average of 74% ($SD = 30$) of the subjects in six reporting samples indicated that these youth engaged in various forms of overtly hostile behavior (physical and verbal), although not necessarily directed against their sexual abuse victims. Concerning impulsivity, all subjects of the three reporting samples of pedophilic

Table 7

Youth Sex Offender General Behavioral Interaction Characteristics(Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
General Affective:				
Hostility	n/a	74 (30, 06)	61 (21, 09)	67 (27, 18)
Impulsivity	37 (32, 03)	99 (00, 03)	44 (17, 06)	56 (32, 12)
Social Anxiety	n/a	n/a	51 (02, 03)	70 (26, 05)
General Cognitive:				
Uncooperative	68 (10, 02)	n/a	60 (40, 05)	64 (38, 10)
Low Achievement	n/a	n/a	n/a	59 (50, 03)

offenders were described as being impulsive. In fact, pedophilic youth were significantly more likely to be impulsive than either sexual assault or mixed offense offender samples, $F(2, 11) = 16.94$, $p < .01$, with no main effect for quality of sample, $F(2, 11) = 2.40$, $p = .19$, and no effects with quality as a covariate, $F(1, 11) = .21$, $p = .66$.

Mixed offense offenders exhibited lower rates of hostility and impulsivity than their pedophilic counterparts. An average of 61% of subjects in nine reporting studies indicated that overt hostility was a problem. Impulsivity was a problem in 44% ($SD = 17$) of the subjects from six samples, and social anxiety was a problem in 51% ($SD = 2$) of three reporting samples. There were no significant differences between rates of hostility and impulsivity in youth mixed offense offenders, $F(1, 14) = 2.77$, $p = .12$. Fifty-one percent of subjects, over the three mixed offense offender samples, were described as socially anxious.

General cognitive. An average of 68% ($SD = 10$) of two reporting samples of sexual assault offenders was reported as being uncooperative (refusing to follow directions, or complete agreed tasks). No data were available for pedophilic youth; however, 60% ($SD = 40$, $n = 5$) of mixed offense offenders were similarly described.

No subgroup data met reporting criteria for low achievement (setting and meeting goals). For all offender subgroups combined, 59% were reported as low in achievement.

History of Childhood Victimization
and Perpetrators in Youth
Sex Offenders

Youth sex offenders are commonly reported in the literature to have, themselves, been victims of sexual and physical abuse as children. Table 8 summarizes the findings for this variable. Examined are history of neglect, sexual abuse, physical abuse, and sexual trauma. Limited data on the youth's perpetrators of the neglect and abuse are provided for each variable except sexual trauma.

Neglect. This variable refers to a history of one or both of the parents exhibiting a consistent pattern of failing to meet the physical and/or emotional needs of the subject. Pedophilic youth were most often reported to be or have been victims of physical and/or emotional neglect with an average of 63% (SD = 30) of subjects in seven samples having been identified as neglected.

For sexual assault offenders, an average of 42% (SD = 21) of the samples reporting on this variable was indicated as having been neglected by parents. Mixed offense offenders had the lowest rates at an average of 31% (SD = 31) of four reporting samples. In all cases, variability was high with standard deviations ranging from 46-100% of the mean.

Only limited data were available concerning the neglecting parent. For the all groups combined group, an

Table 8

History of Childhood Victimization and Perpetrators in Youth Sex Offenders
(Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable Subvariable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault Mean% (SD, n)	Pedophilic Mean% (SD, n)	Mixed Offense Mean% (SD, n)	Combined Mean% (SD, n)
Neglect:	42 (21, 04)	63 (30, 07)	31 (31, 04)	49 (30, 15)
Perpetrator: Mother	n/a	n/a	n/a	56 (42, 05)
Sexual Abuse:	42 (24, 14)	56 (25, 11)	33 (22, 29)	40 (24, 54)
Perpetrator:				
Father	n/a	n/a	14 (14, 05)	16 (15, 06)
Mother	n/a	n/a	n/a	2 (00, 02)
Brother	n/a	n/a	11 (13, 03)	12 (11, 04)
Extended Family Member	12 (07, 03)	26 (22, 03)	18 (12, 08)	19 (13, 14)
Baby Sitter	n/a	n/a	4 (02, 05)	18 (33, 08)
Physical Abuse:	45 (14, 09)	45 (29, 08)	31 (23, 18)	39 (24, 36)
Perpetrator:				
Father	27 (03, 02)	n/a	25 (22, 03)	41 (31, 07)
Sexual Trauma:	26 (12, 04)	23 (12, 04)	36 (16, 06)	

average of 56% of reporting subjects indicated that they were neglected by their mothers.

Sexual abuse. This variable refers to a childhood history whereby one or more individuals engaged in sexual contact (sexual arousal of self and/or the child is the intended goal) with the subject. Such contact is a violation of social norms (and usually state statutes) and does not include normal sexual exploration between peers or consenting sexual interaction between older youth.

Pedophilic youth reportedly have the highest rates of sexual victimization with an average of 56% of subjects in 11 samples being themselves reported victims of sexual abuse. Sexual assault offenders have the next highest rates with 42% from 14 samples, and mixed offense offenders the lowest rates with 33% from 29 samples.

Analysis of variance and ANCOVA were conducted on these data and the difference between history of sexual victimization for pedophilic youth versus mixed offense offenders was significant, $F(2, 53) = 3.24$, $p < .05$. Sample quality had no influence on outcome either as a main effect, $F(2, 53) = .442$, $p > .64$, or as a covariate, $F(1, 52) = 1.28$, $p > .26$; hence, the findings were consistent regardless of sample quality coding.

Data on the youths' perpetrators was limited; however, 12% of sexual assault offenders with a history of sexual victimization reported an extended family member as their

perpetrator, and 26% of pedophilic youth with a history of sexual victimization indicated the same.

Data were somewhat more extensive for mixed offense offenders and all groups combined. For the former, 14% of subjects having been sexually abused (sample n = 5) were reportedly abused by their fathers. Eleven percent of subjects having been sexually abused (sample n = 3) were abused by a brother, 18% (sample n = 8) by an extended family member, and 4% (sample n = 5) by a babysitter. Data were very similar for the combined group, except that babysitters appeared more often to be cited as perpetrator of sexual abuse with 18% of those subjects having been sexually abused, reportedly victimized by babysitters.

Physical abuse. This variable refers to a childhood history whereby one or more individuals (acting in some form of supervisory role) intentionally inflicted physical harm upon the subject. It does not include sanctioned forms of corporal punishment, injury as a result of accidents, or injury as a result of fighting between peers.

Both sexual assault and pedophilic offenders reported similar levels of physical abuse with an average of 45% of subjects, from nine and eight samples, respectively, identified as victims of physical abuse. Variability among samples suggested that the findings were more consistent with sexual assault offenders (standard deviations of 14 and 29, respectively).

Mixed offense offenders reportedly have the lowest rates of being physically abused with an average of 31% of subjects from 18 samples having this history. However, inferential analysis (ANOVA) did not find any of the between subgroup differences as statistically significant, $F(2, 34) = 1.70, p=.20$).

Only fathers were identified as perpetrators in the limited number of samples providing data on this subvariable. For sexual assault offenders, 27% of the victims of physical abuse were abused by their fathers. No data were available for pedophilic youth; however, for mixed offense offenders, 25% of the physical abuse victims (study $n = 3$) were abused by fathers.

Sexual trauma. Sexual trauma differs from sexual abuse in that the "traumatic" consequences are usually not intentional, sexual arousal of either the caregiver or child is not the goal, and the behavior is rarely a violation of state or federal statutes. Examples of sexual trauma vary widely by study but include children being unintentionally exposed (usually repeatedly) to adults engaged in overt sexual behavior (e.g., intercourse or oral-genital contact), painful or frightening medical procedures that involve the youth's genitals, accusations that the youth is either a perpetrator or victim of sexual abuse, when in fact the child is not, and being required to participate in the intimate care of another person despite feelings of

embarrassment or unease.

Little research has been conducted on sexual trauma, and the validity of the variable is questionable. The notion appears to be that the attention of a child is drawn to his or her sexuality, or that of another person, then for one reason or another the child experiences considerable embarrassment or some similar negative emotional state. The "trauma" appears to result from the child being unable to express and address his or her feelings about the upsetting event. (Weil (1989) provided some valuable data on these types of events, but did not offer a specific definition of sexual trauma).

Mixed offense offenders have the highest reported rates of sexual trauma with an average rate of 36% (SD = 16) of the subjects from six samples indicating they were so victimized. Sexual assault offenders and pedophilic youth reported similar rates of 26% (SD = 12) and 23% (SD = 12), respectively, for history of sexual trauma. For youth sexual offenders in general (study n = 14), sexual trauma is reported to have occurred in an average of 29% of subjects.

History of Nonsexual Criminal

Offenses and Outcomes

Table 9 summarizes the descriptive data for offender history of criminal offenses other than those that are sex related. Nine subvariables are described under general offenses: arson, theft, assault, alcohol use/abuse, drug

Table 9

History of Nonsex Criminal Offenses and Outcomes in Youth Sex Offenders
(Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
General:				
Arson	28 (13, 02)	2 (1, 02)	36 (24, 07)	27 (23, 12)
Theft	33 (36, 02)	n/a	32 (19, 09)	32 (21, 11)
Assault	n/a	n/a	47 (29, 06)	42 (27, 09)
Alcohol				
Use/Abuse	n/a	n/a	38 (20, 05)	42 (20, 06)
Drug				
Use/Abuse	n/a	n/a	20 (27, 05)	23 (25, 06)
Mixed Alcohol/ Drug Abuse	n/a	n/a	59 (47, 03)	57 (38, 04)
Truancy	n/a	n/a	27 (20, 03)	29 (16, 04)
Animal Cruelty	31 (18, 03)	43 (51, 03)	26 (19, 08)	29 (26, 15)
Other	45 (01, 02)	52 (43, 03)	49 (24, 13)	48 (24, 19)
Dispositions:				
Acquitted/Charges				
Dropped	42 (24, 03)	n/a	66 (29, 05)	58 (26, 09)
Probation	n/a	n/a	40 (11, 04)	44 (27, 07)
Incarceration	64 (40, 06)	n/a	35 (30, 08)	53 (38, 19)
Court-Ordered Treatment	10 (07, 02)	37 (54, 03)	69 (47, 06)	49 (48, 11)

use/abuse, mixed (unspecified) drug/alcohol abuse, truancy, animal cruelty, and another (unspecified criminal activity) category. Four subvariables are described under dispositions: acquitted/charges dropped, probation, incarceration, and court-ordered treatment.

General offenses. The first subvariable described is arson. For the youth sexual offenders, this typically refers to setting fires for destructive purposes, and not for financial gain.

Two samples of sexual assault offenders gathered information on history of arson. Of these samples, an average of 28% (SD = 13) of offenders reportedly have engaged in fire-setting. Two samples of pedophilic youth provided the same data; however, only 2% (SD = 1) of this offender group had a history of arson. Data for mixed offense offenders is more extensive. Of seven samples obtained, an average of 36% (SD = 24) of subjects had a history of arson.

Only sexual assault and mixed offense offenders met the coding criteria for theft (shoplifting, larceny, etc.), the second variable. Of two reporting samples for sexual assault offenders, an average of 33% had histories of theft. For mixed offense offenders, an average of 26% had similar histories.

No data were available for sexual assault offenders or pedophilic youth on assault (physically attacking another

person for any reason other than defense). However, six samples of mixed offense offenders reported an average rate of 47% (SD = 29) for having had a history of criminal assault. The combined group total was slightly less at 42% (SD = 27). Hence, assault appears to occur frequently in the criminal histories of some youth sex offenders.

Coding criteria for substance use/abuse histories were met for the mixed offense offender subgroup only. Substance "use" refers to occasional or rare consumption; however data were combined. An average of 38% (SD = 20) of five samples reported using or abusing alcohol, 20% (SD = 27) using or abusing drugs (other than alcohol), and 59% (SD = 47) from three samples reported abusing both. Means for the combined group total added only one additional case to the mixed offense group, and hence, they were very similar (means = 42, 23, and 57%, respectively).

Data on truancy (unexcused absences from school) were available for the mixed offense offenders subgroup only. Three samples reported an average of 27% (SD = 20) of their subjects as having been truant from school. Findings for the combined group total were again very similar (mean = 29%, SD = 16, $n = 4$) as only an additional case was added.

Animal cruelty (engaging in the physical and/or sexual abuse of animals) appears to be fairly common to youth sexual offenders in general, and pedophilic offenders specifically. Although variability is high, an average of

43% (SD = 51) of subjects from 3 pedophilic samples had engaged in such behavior. Thirty-one percent (SD = 18) of sexual assault offenders (study $n = 3$) had similar histories, and 26% (SD = 19) from eight samples of mixed offense offenders had engaged in the physical or sexual abuse of animals.

The final category under general offenses describes criminal histories that are nonsexual, but unspecified, or otherwise did not fit the specific subvariable listings. As can be seen in Table 9, youth sex offenders, regardless of subgroup, frequently have criminal histories unrelated to their sexual offenses. Despite considerable variability between samples, from 45% (sexual assault offenders) to 52% (pedophilic offenders) had criminal histories. For all groups combined, the average rate was 48% (SD = 24).

The only data that met the criteria for conducting inferential analysis were those for mixed offense offenders. No significant differences were found between the types of criminal offenses this group is likely to have a history of committing, $F(4, 42) = 1.80, p = .15$.

Dispositions. The first subvariable noted in Table 9 is being acquitted, or having charges dropped. While no data were available for pedophilic youth, 42% (SD = 24) of sexual assaultive youth and 66% (SD = 29) of mixed offense offenders who were arrested for nonsex criminal offense had the charges dropped, or were acquitted.

Data for probation were more scarce; however, an average of 40% (SD = 11) from four samples of mixed offense offenders who were charged and convicted of nonsex criminal offenses served at least some probation. Nearly as many had been incarcerated. An average of 35% (SD = 30) of eight samples of mixed offense offenders committing nonsex crimes had spent some time in locked youth facilities. The incarceration rates were even higher for sexual assault offenders with an average of 64% of six samples reportedly incarcerated following conviction for criminal activity.

Mixed offense offenders appeared most often to be ordered into some sort of treatment or intervention program following the commission of a nonsex offense. An average of 69% (SD = 47) of reporting samples, who engaged in criminal activity, were court-ordered into a treatment program (frequently a substance abuse program). Thirty-seven percent (SD = 54, $n = 3$) of pedophilic offenders were court-ordered into treatment following nonsex offenses, as were 10% (SD = 7, $n = 2$) of sexual assault offenders. It should be noted that in some cases, treatment was part of a plea-bargained diversion program and did not follow an actual court conviction.

Analysis of variance was conducted to determine if there were any significant differences in the incarceration rates for the subgroups; there were not, $F(2, 15) = .97$, $p > .4$.

Youth Sex Offender and Offense
Characteristics for the First
Reported Sex Offense

The descriptive data summarized in Table 10 provide information surrounding the circumstances of the youth sexual offender's first known sexual offense. The first variable concerns the offender's age at the time of the offense and comprises three categories (subvariables): less than or equal to 5 years, 6 to 12 years, and 13 to 15 years. A 15 and older category was coded but failed to meet reporting criteria.

The second variable is the first victim's age with respect to the offender: significantly younger, peer age, and significantly older.

The final variable concerns the sex of the offender's first victim.

Offender's age. Concerning first offense by age 5 years, data were only available for the mixed offense offender subgroup, and the combined group total. An average of 33% (SD = 0) of two reporting samples of mixed offense offenders committed their first sexual offense prior to the age most children enter first grade. The rate for the combined total was lower, at 21% of four reporting samples. No data met reporting criteria for sexual assault or pedophilic offenders.

According to the four reporting samples of pedophilic

Table 10

Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for First Reported Sex Offense(Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable Subvariable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault Mean% (SD, n)	Pedophilic Mean% (SD, n)	Mixed Offense Mean% (SD, n)	Combined Mean% (SD, n)
Offender's Age:				
</= 5 Years	n/a	n/a	33 (00, 02)	21 (15, 04)
6-12 years	27 (35, 02)	78 (41, 04)	71 (34, 04)	68 (38, 11)
13-15 years	67 (28, 03)	n/a	49 (19, 03)	57 (21, 07)
Victim's Age with Respect to Offender:				
Sig. Younger	n/a	83 (35, 05)	70 (26, 12)	72 (28, 20)
Peer	n/a	n/a	26 (14, 06)	43 (32, 10)
Sig. Older	n/a	n/a	28 (19, 04)	32 (17, 06)
Sex of Victim:				
Female	81 (21, 04)	n/a	63 (25, 07)	73 (24, 14)
Male	32 (26, 02)	n/a	35 (21, 06)	46 (32, 11)

youth, an average of 78% (SD = 41) began their sexual offense history between the ages of 6 and 12. Seventy-one percent (SD = 34, n = 4) of mixed offense offenders did likewise, and only 27% (SD = 35, n = 2) of sexual assault offenders began sexually offending during the elementary school years.

Of three reporting samples, an average of 67% (SD = 28) of sexual assault offenders began their sexually aggressive behavior between the ages of 13 and 15. For mixed offense offenders, an average of 49% (SD = 19) began offending during the early adolescent years. No data were available for pedophilic youth, perhaps indicating that most of this group had already committed their first offense.

Victim's age. Three subvariables comprise this variable. Significantly younger refers to a victim who was at least 3 to 5 years younger (depending upon the offender's age with 4 to 5 year differences commonly cited for older offenders) than the offender. Peer age victims were within 3 to 5 years of the offender in age (for the same reason as above), and significantly older victims were at least 3 to 5 years older than the offender. No data met coding criteria for sexual assault offenders and first victim's age.

For 83% (SD = 35) of five reporting samples of pedophilic offenders, the first sexual offense victim involved someone who was significantly younger than they were. For mixed offense offenders the first victim was

significantly younger in an average of 70% (SD = 26, n = 12) of the cases.

For peer age victims, data were only available for mixed offense offenders and group totals. Twenty-six percent (SD = 14) of mixed offense offenders victimized peers in their initial sex offense. However, the mean for all youth sex offenders combined is somewhat higher (43%, SD = 32).

As above, the data for having a significantly older first victim were limited to mixed offense offenders and combined totals. An average of 28% (SD = 19) of the subjects in four samples of mixed offense offenders victimized individuals significantly older than themselves. For all groups combined the rate was 32% (SD = 17).

Victim's sex. No data met coding criteria for sex of first victim with the pedophilic youth subgroup. For sexual assault offenders, an average of 81% (SD = 21, n = 4) of four reporting samples offended against females on their first offense, and 32% offended against males (SD = 26, n = 2). For mixed offense offenders, an average of 63% of first victims were female (SD = 25, n = 7) and 35% were male (SD = 21, n = 6). The difference for mixed offense offenders on sex of first victim approached significance at $F(1, 12) = 4.60$, $p < .06$, with females being most often victimized.

Youth Sex Offender and OffenseCharacteristics for AllReported Sex Offenses

Table 11 summarizes the findings for offender and offense characteristics for all reported offenses. Four main variables were examined: number of separate victims, victim's ages with respect to offender, sex of victims, and extent of offender coercion.

Number of separate victims. The number of separate victims offenders were known to have had was broken down into four categories: 1, 2 to 5, 6 to 10, 11 to 25, and 26 or more. It is important to note that these data were confounded by the offender's age, in that samples containing largely younger offenders were likely to have fewer victims while older offenders were likely to have more.

Data for sexual assault offenders were available for the 2 to 5 victims category only. An average of 44% (SD = 8) of two reporting samples of sexual assault offenders had between two and five victims. An average of 68% (SD = 40) of four samples of pedophilic offenders reportedly had only one victim. Fifty-five percent (SD = 43) of five samples of pedophilic offenders had an average of 2 to 5 victims. Data for mixed offense offenders were less scarce. Forty-seven percent (SD = 22), averaged over nine samples, had only one victim; 44% (SD = 23, n = 12), 2 to 5 victims; 21% (SD = 20, n = 4), 6 to 10 victims; 19% (SD = 21, n = 4) 11 to 25

Table 11

Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for All Reported Offenses(Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Number of				
Separate Victims:				
1	n/a	68 (40, 04)	47 (22, 09)	50 (29, 15)
2-5	44 (08, 02)	55 (43, 05)	44 (23, 12)	48 (26, 21)
6-10	n/a	n/a	21 (20, 04)	19 (16, 06)
11-25	n/a	n/a	19 (21, 04)	20 (16, 06)
26+	n/a	n/a	6 (05, 03)	22 (38, 06)
Victim Age's with				
Respect to Offender:				
Sig. Younger	51 (25, 06)	99 (00, 15)	73 (23, 25)	77 (25, 48)
Peer	52 (31, 07)	n/a	36 (23, 13)	44 (29, 21)
Sig. Older	11 (05, 03)	n/a	30 (30, 12)	29 (27, 17)
Mixed	83 (33, 04)	n/a	75 (41, 03)	82 (32, 08)
Sex of Victims:				
Female	66 (32, 06)	58 (30, 09)	58 (27, 24)	59 (28, 39)
Male	49 (29, 04)	44 (20, 07)	33 (19, 21)	38 (21, 32)
Mixed	66 (57, 03)	66 (43, 10)	75 (41, 03)	50 (42, 27)

(table continues)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
<u>Subvariable</u>	<u>Mean% (SD, n)</u>	<u>Mean% (SD, n)</u>	<u>Mean% (SD, n)</u>	<u>Mean% (SD, n)</u>
Offender Coercion:				
No Coercion/Force	n/a	29 (19, 03)	32 (34, 03)	30 (25, 26)
Verbal Coercion	n/a	68 (22, 04)	48 (35, 11)	53 (33, 15)
Physical Force	57 (43, 02)	46 (38, 11)	41 (26, 18)	45 (31, 32)

victims; and 6% (SD = 5, n = 3) 26 or more victims.

Clearly, there was considerable variability between samples (in many cases due to the age differences of the samples); however, as can be seen in the all groups combined category, many offenders victimize large numbers of people.

Victim ages. The criterion for victim ages, with respect to the offender, was the same as those for "first victim," described above, with the additional category of "mixed" for offenders who victimize persons of different ages.

Data for sexual assault offenders were fairly extensive. An average of 51% (SD = 25) of six reporting samples of sexually assaultive youth offended victims significantly younger than themselves, and 52% (SD = 31, n = 7) preferred peer-age victims. Finally, an average of 11% (SD = 5) of three reporting samples offended against individuals significantly older than they themselves were. However, the vast majority of sexual assault offenders (83%, SD = 33) were not very discriminating and perpetrated offenses against individuals of different ages.

For pedophilic offenders, 15 reporting samples indicate that all subjects (99%, SD = 0) preferred victims significantly younger than they themselves were. However, there were no data for any of the other categories--not 0% findings--suggesting that pedophilic offenders may offend (albeit perhaps rarely) victims of different ages, but the

appropriate research question was not asked. This finding may also be the result of tighter clinical and research definitions for what a pedophilic youth is.

Mixed offense offenders appeared to offend most frequently against children significantly younger than they themselves were. An average of 73% ($SD = 23$, $n = 25$) of this group had molested younger children, while 36% ($SD = 23$, $n = 13$) preferred peer age victims, and 30% ($SD = 30$, $n = 12$) preferred older victims. As with the sexual assault offenders, a large percentage (75%, $SD = 45$) of this group offended against individuals of different ages.

Analysis of variance results indicate that there was no significant difference in the ages of persons victimized by sexual assault offenders, $F(2, 15) = .09$, $p = .1$. However, mixed offense offenders were more likely to have had victims who were significantly younger, than older, $F(2, 49) = 5.29$, $p < .001$.

Analysis of variance was run to determine if subgroups were likely to target victims of specific age groups. Pedophilic offenders were significantly more likely to offend against younger children than were either mixed offense or sexual assault offenders, and mixed offense offenders were significantly more likely to victimize younger children than were sexual assault offenders, $F(2, 45) = 18.58$, $p < .001$. There was no significant main effect for sample quality, $F(2, 45) = 2.88$, $p > .07$), and no

interaction effects between subgroup and quality, $F(4, 45) = 2.01$, $p > .1$. Analysis of covariance demonstrated that quality of sample had no effect on the findings for subgroup differences, $F(1, 45) = 1.77$, $p = .19$.

There were no significant differences between sexual assault offenders and mixed offense offenders for preference of peer-age victims, $F(2, 20) = 2.44$, $p = .12$. Neither were there main effects for sample quality, $F(1, 20) = 1.26$, $p = .28$) nor interactions, $F(1, 20) = .07$, $p = .8$.

Sex of victims. One of the most interesting findings of this analysis is the evidence that youth offenders appear to frequently commit offenses against males, as well as females. Six samples of sexual assault offenders reported that 66% (SD = 32) of this subgroup have offended against females, while 49% (SD = 29, $n = 4$) had sexually assaulted males, and 66% (SD = 57, $n = 3$) had offended against both sexes.

Data were very similar for pedophilic youth. Of subjects in nine reporting samples, an average of 58% (SD = 30) had molested females, 44% (SD = 20, $n = 7$) had molested males, and 66% (SD = 43, $n = 10$) had molested both sexes. There were no significant differences between these means, $F(2, 25) = .87$, $p > .4$.

For mixed offense offenders, 24 reporting samples indicated that an average of 58% (SD = 27) of this group offended against females, and an average of 33% (SD = 19) of

21 samples offended against males. Thirteen samples reported an average of 31% (SD = 41) of mixed offense offenders committing sexual offenses against both males and females. There was a significant difference between the means for victimizing females and males, with mixed offense offenders significantly more likely to offend against females, $F(2, 57) = 7.02, p=.002$.

Victimizing females did not significantly discriminate between the subgroups of offenders, $F(2, 38) = .04, p>.9$, nor was sample quality a factor, $F(2, 38) = .85, p>.4$. Furthermore, there was no significant interaction effect between subgroup and sample quality for female victims $F(2, 38) = 2.45, p=.08$. ANCOVA also yielded no significant differences between subgroups on this variable, $F(2, 38) = .06, p>.9$.

Offender victimization of males also did not significantly discriminate offender subgroups, $F(2, 31) = 1.66, p=.21$, although interaction effects between offender subgroup and quality were significant for male victims, $F(3, 31) = 3.52, p=.03$. Quality 1 samples had the highest mean (39%) for mixed offense offender samples, quality 2 (71%) for sexual assault offenders, and quality 3 (67%) for pedophilic offenders. ANCOVA exhibited essentially the same result for subgroup of offender main effects, $F(2, 31) = 1.24, p>.3$.

Offender coercion. The final descriptive results

summarized in Table 11 concern the degree of coercion the offender utilized to obtain compliance from his victim. The first subvariable represents the proportion of victims for whom explicit use of verbal coercion or physical force on the part of the offender was absent. Two caveats are warranted. In nearly all cases the data were based on offender accounts and are highly subject to offender bias, and secondly, most states do not legally recognize the child as being competent to consent to sexual behavior prior to the age of 14 (varies somewhat by state). Thus, even if the victim is a "willing participant" in the sexual activity, he/she cannot give legal consent.

No data were available for sexual assault offenders and no coercion/force used. For pedophilic youth, an average of 29% (SD = 19) of subjects in three samples report that their victims openly cooperated with the offender. For mixed offense offenders the rate is somewhat higher with 32% (SD = 34) of three samples making the same claim.

Verbal coercion involves the use of threats, verbal intimidation, or pleading to obtain victim compliance. Again no data from sexual assault offenders met coding criteria for this variable. Of seven samples of pedophilic offenders, an average of 65% (SD = 29) used verbal coercion to obtain victim cooperation. Pedophilic offenders were significantly more likely to use verbal coercion to obtain cooperation than have victims that cooperated without

coercion, $F(1, 16) = 9.09$, $p < .01$. Forty-nine percent ($SD = 30$) of 16 mixed offense offender samples used verbal coercion.

Physical force (physically overpowering, using weapons, etc.) was used in an average of 57% ($SD = 43$) of two reporting samples of sexual assault offenders as means to obtain victim compliance. For pedophilic youth the rate averaged 46% ($SD = 38$) of subjects in 11 samples, and for mixed offense offenders the rate was an average of 41% ($SD = 26$) of subjects in 18 samples. There were no significant differences in the means mixed offense offenders used to obtain victim compliance, $F(1, 32) = 3.24$, $p = .08$.

Use of verbal coercion did not significantly discriminate between pedophilic and mixed offense offenders, $F(1, 22) = 3.09$, $p = .1$, and there were no significant interaction effects between subgroup of offender and quality of sample, $F(2, 22) = 2.69$, $p = .1$. ANCOVA results were essentially similar for subgroup main effects, $F(1, 22) = 1.47$, $p = .24$.

Use of physical force also failed to significantly discriminate between subgroups of offenders, $F(2, 30) = .28$, $p = .76$. Further, there was no significant interaction effect, $F(3, 30) = 2.73$, $p = .07$, between subgroup of offender and quality of sample. ANCOVA results also yielded no differences between subgroups of offenders on use of physical force, $F(1, 30) = .22$, $p = .8$.

Use of Disinhibiting Agents
as Related to Sexually
Offensive Behavior

Two variables are described in Table 12: the use of pornography (magazines, movies, etc.) as a sexual stimulus and use of alcohol and/or drugs as behavioral disinhibitors.

Pornography as a sexual stimulus. Sexual assault offenders reported the highest rates for use of pornographic material of all reporting groups. An average of 67% (SD = 46) of subjects in three reporting samples are identified as users of pornography as an aid for sexual arousal. Twenty-five percent (SD = 11, n = 2) of pedophilic youth reported the same. No data were available for mixed offense offenders.

Alcohol and drug disinhibitors. Sexual assault offenders were also the most frequent users of alcohol and/or drugs prior to engaging in sexual activity (both illicit and consensual). Forty percent (SD = 20) of five samples report intoxication, to some degree, prior to sexual activity. No data were available for pedophilic offenders; however, 33% of mixed offense offenders reported using alcohol and/or drugs prior to engaging in sexual behavior.

Table 12

Youth Sex Offender Characteristics Allegedly Related to Offense Behavior(Quality 1 - 3 Samples)

Variable Subvariable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault Mean% (SD, n)	Pedophilic Mean% (SD, n)	Mixed Offense Mean% (SD, n)	Combined Mean% (SD, n)
Use of Pornography as a Sexual Stimulus:	67 (46, 03)	25 (11, 02)	n/a	53 (37, 06)
Use of Alcohol/Drugs as Disinhibitors:	40 (20, 05)	n/a	33 (29, 06)	40 (25, 13)

Descriptive Analysis for Combined Quality 1 and 2 Samples

Tables 20 through 30 in Appendix E summarize the descriptive findings for the best two sample qualities (quality 1 and 2). In general, the two groups of descriptive statistics are fairly similar (as evidenced by the generally small impact that quality of sample has on the inferential results). For this section, quality 1 and 2 descriptive will be discussed where there is an absolute difference of 20% or more from the quality 1-3 mean. Hence, if all samples report the rate for variable A as 100%, then variable A will be discussed in this section if the rate for quality 1 and 2 findings is 80% or less. If the rate is 50% in quality 1-3 samples, then to be included here, the rate must be reported as either 40% or less, or 60% or more. By subtracting quality 1 and 2 from quality 1-3 n sizes, the number of quality 3 samples can be determined for any variable where data were reported.

Demographic Characteristics

Table 20 summarizes the findings for demographic characteristics.

Family type. Some differences between sample quality on this variable were noted. For pedophilic offenders, an average of 49% (SD = 33) of five reporting samples came from biologically intact families (an increase of 20% from all

quality findings). For blended, there were no quality 1 and 2 samples reporting (versus a mean of 24% for all quality samples combined).

For mixed offense offenders, blended families may be somewhat less common when better quality samples are examined. Quality 1 and 2 analyses reported that 16% (SD = 10, n = 5) of these youth came from blended families, versus 20% for all combined quality findings, a difference of 20%.

For the other pedophilic and mixed offense offender family types and for all sexual assault offenders, the differences were fairly small.

Ethnicity. Two differences were noted between the descriptive findings on ethnicity. For sexual assault offenders, 13% (SD = 13, n = 5) of these youth were reported as Hispanic. This is a 24% decrease from the quality 1-3 descriptive. For mixed offense offenders, 2% (SD = 1, n = 4) were reportedly Oriental and 3% (SD = 1, n = 3) Native American, increases of 50 and 67%, respectively, from the combined quality findings.

SES/Income. While all samples combined tend to suggest that pedophilic youth came from both lower SES and middle SES households at similar rates (51% and 49%, respectively), the quality 1 and 2 samples reported that about a fifth more of these youth were middle SES (69%), although only two samples reported. Correspondingly, about 24% fewer came from lower SES families (39% versus 51%). There were no

samples of quality 1 or 2 that reported on upper SES for mixed offense offenders, whereas two quality 3 samples indicated that 10% of these youth came from upper SES households. Remaining findings are similar regardless of sample quality.

Referral source. Three reported subvariables in the all samples combined descriptive analysis (i.e., child protection for sexual assault offenders, and self-referral and probation and parole for mixed offense offenders) were empty, indicating that the data were all quality 3 data. The only referral source rate for sexual assault offenders that differed by 20%, or more, was probation/parole where 20% fewer (12%) of these youth were reportedly referred for treatment by probation or parole officers.

There were no major differences between quality of samples on remaining variables for sexual assault, pedophilic, or mixed offense offenders. For offender subgroups combined, family members were cited as much less frequent sources of referral (9% versus 31%).

Education level. Results from this descriptive analysis continue to demonstrate that youth offenders achieved all levels of education.

Religion. No data met reporting criteria for this analysis.

Parental and Family Characteristics

Table 21 summarizes these findings.

Alcohol abuse. While paternal alcohol abuse rates were unchanged regardless of sample quality, maternal rates were lower for pedophilic youth. For pedophilic youth, an average of 19% (SD = 8, $n = 3$) of quality 1 and 2 samples reported mothers abusing alcohol, while the rates were 43% for all samples combined (a decrease of 66%). Correspondingly, the variability between samples was much less (SD = 8 versus 34). For all subgroups of youth sex offenders combined, there was a 22% lower rate for maternal abuse of alcohol when only the best two quality samples are examined (mean = 28%, SD = 25, $n = 11$).

Drug abuse. Reporting criteria were not met for paternal drug abuse for pedophilic youth; otherwise, all data were essentially similar with differences of no more than 6%.

Mental illness. Fathers of mixed offense offenders had an average reported mental illness rate of 20% less (4% versus 5%) when quality 3 samples were omitted from descriptive analysis.

History of child neglect. These findings were essentially similar as those in the quality 1-3 descriptive analysis.

History of child physical abuse. No data met reporting criteria for maternal history of physical abuse. For mixed offense offenders, quality 1 and 2 findings reported an average rate 52% lower for paternal history of being

physically abusive, and less variable (mean = 11, SD = 5, n = 3), than for analyses that includes quality 3 samples.

History of child sexual abuse. No data met reporting criteria for this variable.

Maternal history of childhood victimization. Findings were essentially the same for this variable, regardless of sample quality.

Paternal history of childhood victimization. All data on this variable were either quality 1 or 2; there were no differences in this analysis from quality 1-3 results.

Family interaction style. No data met reporting criteria for the pedophilic subvariable chaotic/rigid, or for the mixed offense offender subvariables flexible/structured, or separated/connected. For mixed offense offenders, quality 1 and 2 descriptives show that an average of 47% (SD = 4) of two reporting samples had families that were disengaged or enmeshed on the cohesion dimension of family interaction, a decrease of 22% from the quality 1-3 analysis. All remaining findings were very similar, regardless of quality of sample.

Youth Sex Offender Medical/Psychiatric

Histories

See Table 22 for a summary of these findings.

Medical history. No subvariable data for mixed offense offenders met reporting criteria for head injury. Only one third as many of these youth were reported to have

unspecified disabilities when quality 3 samples were omitted from analysis. However, for all offender subgroups combined, an average of 48% (SD = 32, n = 5) of youth sex offenders had a history of experiencing some type of head injury.

Characterological orientation/traits. The only difference that met reporting criteria was that for sexual assault offenders and antisocial traits. When quality 3 samples were omitted from analysis, 20% (SD = 15, n = 2) of these youth reportedly exhibited antisocial traits, an increase of 25% from quality 1-3 findings (mean = 16%).

DSM-III-R diagnoses. These results were essentially the same as those from quality 1-3 analysis.

History of psychological intervention. No data met reporting criteria for pedophilic youth and offense related psychological intervention. For sexual assault offenders, when quality 3 samples were omitted from analysis, an average of 52% (SD = 54) of two reporting samples indicated that these youth had received psychological intervention related to previous sex offenses (an increase of 27% over quality 1-3 findings). All other findings were essentially similar.

Youth Sex offender Educational Histories

Table 23 summarizes these findings.

Extracurricular activities. No differences were noted

due to sample quality.

Academic problems. No differences were noted due to sample quality.

Estimated IQ. No data met reporting criteria for sexual assault offenders and IQ below 85. For pedophilic offenders, quality 1 and 2 samples reported that these youth were about 60% less likely to have estimated IQs less than 85 (mean = 15%, SD = 4, n = 2), than when quality 3 samples are added to the analysis. All other findings are very similar.

Interpersonal Relationship

Characteristics

Table 24 summarizes the findings for interpersonal relationship characteristics.

Social isolation from parents. No findings met reporting criteria for any of the youth offender subgroups. However, for all subgroups combined, the results were essentially similar.

Social skills deficit. For sexual assault offenders, quality 1 and 2 descriptive data indicated that these youth exhibited a somewhat greater deficit in social skills during interactions with females than when quality 3 samples are added to the analysis. An average of 34% (SD = 6, n = 2) of reporting samples (compared to 27%) for about a 21% increase was noted.

For pedophilic offenders, the opposite trend was

observed for social skills with male peers. Without quality 3 samples, an average of 44% of pedophilic youth was reported as having a deficit in their repertoire of social skills for social interactions with other boys, a decrease of about 24% from previous findings. However, the standard deviation was very high (50), and the n was only 3. Remaining findings were essentially similar.

Social confidence. No data met reporting criteria for pedophilic youth and social confidence with same-sex peers, nor mixed offense offenders and same-sex peers. All other findings were similar, regardless of sample quality.

Social isolation. No means differed by more than 16% when sample quality was a factor in the descriptive analyses of this variable.

General Behavioral Interaction

Characteristics

See table 25 for a summary of the findings for general behavioral interaction characteristics.

General affective. All findings of the quality 1 and 2 analysis were very similar to the quality 1-3 analysis.

General cognitive. Mixed offense offenders were reportedly more uncooperative when quality 3 samples were omitted from analysis. An average of 87% (SD = 10) of three reporting samples described these youth as being uncooperative, whereas only 60% are reported so in the quality 1-3 analysis. This was an increase of 31% over the

earlier findings. All other findings were essentially similar.

History of Childhood Victimization
and Perpetrators in Youth
Sex Offenders

Table 26 outlines these findings.

Neglect. An average of 24% (SD = 31) of four samples of mixed offense offenders reported being, or having been, neglected. This was approximately 23% less than the findings for quality 1-3 analysis. No other differences were larger than 17%. The results for all offender subgroups combined, on mother as perpetrator of neglect, were identical at an average of 56%.

Sexual abuse. The results from this analysis were very similar to those of the quality 1-3 analysis. However, for perpetrator of sexual abuse, sexually abused mixed offense offenders were victimized by brothers only 4% of the time, versus 11% when quality 3 samples were included. This was a 64% decrease. For combined subgroups of youth sexually abused, 4% were victimized by brothers, and 6% percent by babysitters, in both instances a 66% decrease over previous findings. For individuals victimized by an extended family member, the rate was 12%, for a 37% decrease.

Physical abuse. The rates of sexual abuse were essentially the same regardless of sample quality. However, for mixed offense offender and father as perpetrator of

sexual abuse, the rate dropped from 25% (quality 1-3 samples) to 11% (SD = 14, n = 4), for a decrease of 66%.

Sexual trauma. These findings were essentially similar as those of the quality 1-3 descriptive analysis.

History of Nonsex Criminal

Offenses and Outcomes

See Table 27 for a summary of these findings.

General offenses. No data met reporting criteria for sexual assault offenders on theft, or other (unspecified) offenses, or pedophilic offenders on arson, or other (unspecified) offenses. All other findings were very similar to quality 1-3 analyses.

Dispositions. All findings were very similar to quality 1-3 analyses.

Youth Sex Offender and Offense

Characteristics for the First

Reported Sex Offense

Table 28 summarizes findings for first reported offenses.

Offender's age. No data met reporting criteria for pedophilic youth on this variable, nor on mixed offense offender for ages at first offense of 5 years or less, or 13-15 years. For all groups of sex offenders combined, only 9% (SD = 6, n = 2) were reported as having committed their offense during the preschool years (≤ 5 years). All other

findings were essentially similar to those presented earlier.

Victim's age. All findings were essentially similar to quality 1-3 analyses.

Sex of victim. All findings were similar to those conducted in the quality 1-3 analysis, except for mixed offense offender and first victim being male. For this variable an average of 20% (SD = 14, n = 3) of these youth offended against another male on their first offense. This was a 43% decrease from the findings when quality 3 samples were included in the analysis.

Youth Sex Offender and Offense

Characteristics for All

Reported Sex Offenses

Table 29 contains a summary of these findings.

Number of separate victims. No data were reported for sexual assault offenders. Data for pedophilic youth were essentially the same.

For mixed offense offenders, an average of only about 11% (SD = 3) of three samples were reported to have between 6 to 10 different victims. That represents about a 48% decrease from the findings when quality 3 samples were included in the analysis. A similar decrease was observed for mixed offense offenders with between 11 and 25 different victims. Here an average of 9% (SD = 5) of five offender samples reported victimizing from 11 to 25 individuals,

whereas approximately 19% so reported when quality 3 samples were included.

Victim ages. Somewhat fewer sexual assault offenders were reported to offend against individuals significantly younger than themselves when quality 3 samples were omitted from analysis. An average of 41% (SD = 8, n = 5) of subjects in reporting samples indicated having offended against children significantly younger than they were. This was approximately 20% fewer offenders than previously noted. All other data for sexual assault offenders on this variable were similar.

Data for pedophilic offenders were identical to the data when quality 3 samples were included in the analysis, and nearly so for mixed offense offenders and the combined groups.

Sex of victims. Data were essentially similar for sexual assault and pedophilic offenders on this variable. For mixed offense offenders, approximately 22% fewer (mean = 40%, SD = 41, n = 7) were reported to victimize both female and male individuals. Findings were very similar for female only and male only victims. For all subgroups of youth sexual offenders combined, the findings were similar regardless of the inclusion of quality 3 samples.

Perpetrator coercion. No differences were noted for sexual assault offenders on this variable. For pedophilic youth, approximately 38% fewer youth (mean = 18%, SD = 1, n

= 2) reported that their victims openly cooperated (no force/coercion) with the molestation. Findings for verbal coercion and physical force were similar with or without quality 3 samples.

Mixed offense offenders reported that their victims openly cooperated approximately 59% less often than when quality 3 samples were included in the analysis. Only an average of 13% (SD = 14, n = 2) of these youth made such a claim in this analysis. Other data for mixed offense offenders on this variable were essentially similar to those noted earlier, as were data for all youth offenders combined.

Use of Disinhibiting Agents as Related to Sexually Offensive Behavior

Table 30 summarizes these findings.

Pornography as a sexual stimuli. No data met reporting criteria for any of the individual offender subgroups. However, for the combined group the use of pornography was considerably higher when quality 3 samples were dropped from the analysis. An average of 94% (SD = 7, n = 2) of all youth offenders (combined) reportedly used pornography as a sexual stimulus, compared to 53% for quality 1-3 samples.

Alcohol and drugs as disinhibitors. Findings for this variable were very similar to those that include quality 3 samples.

CHAPTER 5

IMPLICATIONS

Typological Considerations

Data Limitations

Individual subject data on variables and subvariables were generally not available from published research studies. It simply required too much space to include. In fact, the data were frequently not even available from the original researchers. For example, the vast majority of studies did not indicate that subject A came from a biologically intact family of middle SES, was White, Protestant, committed his first offense at age 12, against a 5-year-old female, and so forth. This was one of the reasons that findings for variables in this study were summed over samples and not subjects. Despite the fact that much can be done with the data, certain analyses were prohibited. In a meta-analysis such as this, it cannot be determined, for example, how many Caucasian subjects came from blended families, or how many offenders who committed their first offense before age 12 prefer to victimize males. Furthermore, the differences between variables could not be assessed (e.g., Black sexual assault offenders and SES).

As it was, many of the assumptions of analysis of variance and analysis of covariance were violated (sometimes grossly) in this study. Hopefully, it is recognized that

these techniques are fairly robust and can endure moderate abuse, and more importantly, that it was the descriptive analysis, not the inferential, that was considered most important. Nonetheless, one of the main goals of this study is to begin the process of conceptualizing the youthful offender, by offense type, if and where data existed to do so. Unfortunately, techniques such as discriminant analysis and multiple regression analysis (that would require individual subject data) to predict offender subtype based on selected variables would certainly be abusing liberties above and beyond those that even the most opportunistic social scientist would take with statistical assumptions.

The results of the analyses conducted here do begin the conceptualization process; however, more variables than expected met reporting criteria. Furthermore, with the data presented as means, standard deviations, F statistics, and probabilities, the findings were somewhat overwhelming and difficult to interpret. Therefore, to highlight some of the more clinically (and statistically) relevant findings, the following tables summarize offender variables that had a high likelihood of being clinically relevant, were consistent, and/or statistically discriminated between subgroups of offenders. This has been operationalized as where an average of at least 50% of reporting subjects in a minimum of two reporting samples exhibited a particular characteristic, with a standard deviation between samples of

no more than 50% of the mean. For example, the minimum reporting criteria were mean = 50%, SD = 25, n = 2. Findings from quality 1 and 2 samples were also reported when they met the above reporting criteria, and/or when the two means differed by more than 10 percentage points. Data were also reported when inferential tests indicated significant differences between subgroups on variables/ regardless of mean sizes or standard deviations. Inferential data were based only upon the findings of the quality 1 through 3 samples.

Sexual Assault Offenders

Table 13 highlights variables that, based upon existing research, characterized important features of the youth sexual assault offender. Perhaps the most salient features of this population were the high rates at which they came from single parent (nearly always mother) headed families. Adding to the significance of this finding was that single parent families discriminated this offender subgroup from both the pedophilic and mixed offense offenders. The relatively small standard deviation (only 18% of the mean) indicated that the finding was fairly consistent across samples.

Youth sexual assault offenders also tended to be referred for treatment from juvenile courts (this finding was more consistent when quality 1 and 2 samples are examined). Fathers of these youth, at least for those

Table 13

Clinically Relevant Characteristics of Youth Sexual Assault
Offenders

Variable Subvariable	Percentage/SD Quality all (1 - 2)	Between Group Difference (p.<.05)
Family Type:		
Single	78/14	Pedophilic, Mixed Offense
Referral Source:		
Juvenile Court	72/40 (83/32)	
Parental Alcohol Abuse:		
Paternal	53/04	
Social Isolation From:		
Mother	62/30 (83/--)	
General Cognitive:		
Uncooperative	68/10	
Offender's Age at First Sex Offense:		
13-15 years	67/28	
Sex of First Victim:		
Female	81/21	
Victim Age's with Respect to Offender:		
Sig. Younger	51/25 (41/08)	
Mixed	83/33 (77/38)	
Sex of Victims:		
Female	66/32	
Use of Pornography as a Sexual Stimulus:	67/46 (94/07)	

samples reporting, had consistently high rates of alcohol abuse (perhaps why so many have parents who have divorced), and these youth were socially isolated from their mothers. It is reasonable to hypothesize that a general lack of parental monitoring allowed these youngsters to become involved in illicit activities and, hence, involvement with the juvenile court system.

Although these youths appeared to be labeled as uncooperative, what is perhaps surprising is that they were not consistently reported as overtly hostile or impulsive, nor were they diagnosed as conduct disordered. In fact, both the pedophilic and mixed offense offenders were generally reported as exhibiting higher rates of these problem behaviors.

Sexual assault offenders tended to commit their first offense between the ages of 13 and 15, and the victim was usually a female. In general, these youth victimized more females than males, and frequently committed offenses against victims who were both younger than they, and peer age, or older. Finally, pornography was frequently used by these youth as a means to achieve sexual arousal.

Treatment implications. Several implications for intervention are suggested by the data above. First is the apparent lack of parental support and supervision many of these youth appear to experience. The combination of being from a single parent (mother headed) family and being

socially isolated from mother may have important implications for the development of sexually assaultive behavior that is most frequently directed towards females. Furthermore, a father troubled by alcohol abuse or dependence would typically render the noncustodial parent unavailable for emotional support and guidance.

Another facet of this offender subgroup that should be considered is that offenses against significantly younger children are apparently common. The assaultive nature of their sexual offenses may pose an especially serious threat to children they may come in contact with, and may suggest that, at least as minors, their offenses are more varied than their adult counterparts. This may be especially relevant since these youth may not "appear" to otherwise be overtly hostile, impulsive, or dangerous.

A final consideration is the rate at which these youth use pornography as a sexual stimulus. Relatively few studies examine this variable in relationship to youth sexual offending. However, it may prove to be a very important treatment consideration as these magazines and movies tend to exploit and dehumanize females in general, and could result in conditioning feelings of power, control and domination to sexual arousal, a particularly dangerous outcome given the lack of supervision and support noted above.

Pedophilic Youth

The characteristics of pedophilic youth, summarized in Table 14, differed considerably from those of sexual assault offenders. There was no particular family type or socioeconomic background from which they came. Pedophilic youth were most often referred by clinicians (mental health workers and medical doctors) for treatment specific to sexual offending, followed closely by juvenile courts and "other" sources. Paternal drug abuse was consistently cited as a problem in the families of these youth (paternal alcohol abuse was also high, but variability is wide), and mothers were frequently cited as having been themselves victims of physical abuse as children.

One of the characteristics that seems to be the hallmark of this group is family dysfunction. In both terms of adaptability and cohesion, these youth appeared to have frequently come from families where appropriate boundaries, positive coping ability, emotional support, and consistent positive parenting are rare commodities.

Pedophilic youth also appeared to lack the confidence to engage in social interaction with male peers (not necessarily female peers), but were socially isolated from both. Perhaps surprisingly, these youth may not lack the social skills (repertoire of socially appropriate behaviors) for social interactions with peers, but remain isolated for other reasons, for example, perhaps a preoccupation with

Table 14

Clinically Relevant Characteristics of Pedophilic Youth

Variable Subvariable	Percentage/SD Quality all (1 - 2)	Between Group Difference (p.<.05)
Socioeconomic Status:		
Middle (\$15,000-59,000)	49/22	(61/11)
Lower (<\$15,000)	51/23	(39/12)
Referral Source:		
Clinician	83/40	
Court	80/33	
Other	72/36	
Parental Drug Abuse:		
Paternal	66/09	
Maternal History of Childhood Victimization:		
Physical Abuse	63/22	
Family Interaction Style (Adaptability):		
Chaotic/Rigid	89/22	99/00
Family Interaction Style (Cohesion):		
Disengaged/ Enmeshed	89/27	99/00
Estimated IQ:		
85-115	82/00	
Lacks Social Confidence with:		
Male Peers	99/00	

(table continues)

Variable Subvariable	Percentage/SD Quality all (1 - 2)	Between Group Difference (p.<.05)
Social		
Isolation from:		
Female Peers	92/13	Sexual Assault
Male Peers	92/13	Sexual Assault
General Affective:		
Hostility	74/30	
Impulsivity	99/00	Sexual Assault, Mixed Offense
Offender		
Victim of:		
Neglect	63/30	(76/20)
Sexual Abuse	56/25	
Offender's Age at First Sex Offense:		
6-12 years	78/41	(97/02)
First Victim's Age with Respect To Offender		
Sig. Younger	83/35	(99/00)
Victim Age's with Respect of Offender:		
Sig. Younger	99/00	
Sex of Victims:		
Female	58/30	(51/19)
Offender Coercion:		
Verbal Coercion	65/29	

family difficulties.

Unlike sexual assault offenders, pedophilic youth were frequently noted as hostile and impulsive. The important discriminating feature of the offense histories of these offender subgroups appeared to be that pedophilic youth were less likely to consistently use physical force to obtain victim compliance. However, these individuals did act-out

in a hostile and impulsive manner in other areas of their lives. In fact, impulsivity significantly differentiates these youth from both sexual assault and mixed offense offenders.

Pedophilic youth tended to have fairly high, and consistent, rates for being victims of both neglect and sexual abuse. The rates for neglect were even higher and more consistent when only quality 1 and 2 samples were examined.

Members of this subgroup generally committed their first sexual offense between the ages of 6 and 12 years, consistently molested children significantly younger than they were, and preferred female victims, but with less consistency than either sexual assault or mixed offense offenders. Pedophilic offenders also tended to use verbal coercion, threats, and manipulation to obtain victim compliance.

Treatment implications. Perhaps what stands out about this subgroup of youth sex offenders is the severe family problems that seem to accompany the phenomenon. It is doubtful that effective, long-term success can be achieved without involving the family in the treatment process. This is especially likely to be true when the offending youth is to remain in the family. Therefore, with this group of offenders it appears paramount for the clinician to, at minimum, assess family functioning as part of the evaluation

and treatment process of the offending youth. Where serious family problems are detected, treatment can be initiated to meet the family's needs in addition to those of the youth.

The relationship between the lack of social competence with male peers and social isolation from both male and female peers needs to be examined further. It is possible that the missing data concerning social confidence with female peers are a result of researchers not asking the appropriate questions, rather than a negative finding. It is also conceivable that the lack of social confidence with male peers is responsible for the social isolation from peers of both sexes. For example, a lack of social confidence with male peers may result in these youth abstaining from participation in same-sex friendship groups as preadolescents. As a result, when these youth approach early adolescence, they miss out on the opportunity to observe somewhat older or socially more outgoing peers in the group model social behavior with other (especially female) peers.

Social isolation from peers may also increase the likelihood that these youth will meet their social needs with persons who are less of a threat and less socially precocious--in particular, younger children, or those developmentally less mature--than the youth's peers. Evidence of isolation from peers might be seen quite early, such as in 6- and 7-year-olds preferring to play with

preschool-age children.

The final clinical issue that may warrant attention for this subgroup of youth sex offenders is that concerning hostility and impulsivity. Given the family problems that these youth often experience, and their lack of healthy and appropriate social outlets, the overt anger, frustration, and acting-out they exhibit is probably a fairly "normal" response. Nevertheless, these characteristics, especially the impulsivity, may put the youth at increased risk for sexually molesting those same children he feels safest socializing with. In addition, offending provides a very dangerous and unhealthy vent for angry feelings, and sexual and social frustrations.

Mixed Offense Offenders

As a reminder, this subgroup comprised those youth who committed a variety of offenses: sexual assault, molesting children younger than they, exhibitionism, voyeurism, frotteurism, and so forth. It also contained those samples that did not meet the definition for any of the specific subgroups of youth offenders.

As noted in Table 15, this subgroup of youth sex offenders probably displayed the most widespread and severe problems of all. They frequently came from low SES households, may have had mothers who themselves had been victims of neglect as children, may have been socially isolated from fathers, and often had families with serious

Table 15

Clinically Relevant Characteristics of Mixed Offense
Offenders

Variable Subvariable	Percentage/SD Quality all (1 - 2)	Between Group Difference (p.<.05)
Socioeconomic Status:		
Lower (<\$15,000)	61/26	
Referral Source:		
Clinician	76/38	
Maternal History of Childhood Victimization:		
Neglect	55/08	(99/00)
Family Interaction Style (Adaptability):		
Chaotic/Rigid	57/33	(68/27)
Family Interaction Style (Cohesion):		
Separated/ Connected	53/28	(78/30)
Disengaged/ Enmeshed	60/22	(47/04)
DSM-III-R Diagnosis:		
Conduct Disorder	49/14	
History of Psychological Intervention:		
Not Offense Related	65/23	

(table continues)

Variable	Percentage/SD	Between Group
Subvariable	Quality all (1 - 2)	Difference (p.<.05)
Academic Problems:		
Held Back (1+ Grades)	59/14	
Remedial Intervention	53/23	
Estimated IQ 85-115	70/20	(58/4)
Social Isolation from:		
Father	61/19	(50/00)
Lacks Social Skills with:		
Female Peers	61/31	(75/21)
Male Peers	55/28	(68/21)
Lacks Social Confidence with:		
Female Peers	87/25	(99/00) ^a
Male Peers	87/25	(99/00)
Social Isolation from:		
Female Peers	65/24	(76/21)
Male Peers	69/21	(71/18)
General Affective:		
Hostility	61/21	(72/16)
Social Anxiety	51/02	
General Cognitive Uncooperative	60/40	(87/10)
General Nonsex Offenses:		
Other (Unspecified)	49/24	(55/18)
Dispositions:		
Acquitted/Charges Dropped	66/29	

(table continues)

Variable	Percentage/SD	Between Group
Subvariable	Quality all (1 - 2)	Difference (p.<.05)
Offender's Age at First Sex Offense:		
6-12 years	71/34	(83/27)
13-15 years	49/19	(30/--)
First Victim's Age fifth Respect to Offender:		
Sig. Younger	70/26	
Sex of First Victim:		
Female	63/25	(73/28)
Number of Separate Victims:		
1	47/22	(52/26)
Victim Age's with Respect of Offender:		
Sig. Younger	76/23	
Sex of Victims:		
Female	58/27	(66/25)

* The figures for social confidence are not from identical groups of samples, despite the same results.

problems in terms of adaptability and cohesion.

Furthermore, a diagnosis of conduct disorder, a history of treatment for psychological problems, exhibiting overt hostility, social anxiety, and general uncooperativeness were also characteristics consistently observed in these youth.

These boys were also likely to have experienced academic problems such as being retained one or more grades, and/or having had remedial intervention to academically catch up with peers. These two characteristics were

undoubtedly interrelated. The boys frequently lacked social skills and social confidence and reported being socially isolated from both same and opposite sex peers. Finally, they often had a history of engaging in criminal behavior (unspecified) other than, and in addition to, their sexual offense(s).

Concerning their sexual offense history, these youth tended to commit their first offense between the ages of 6 and 15 years, usually against a female child significantly younger than they. Frequently, they reported having only a single victim; however, when multiple persons are offended against, they tended to be significantly younger than the offender and often included both female and male children.

Treatment implications. Comprehensive assessment appears critical to understanding the antecedents and individual circumstances that are related to the development of mixed offense offending. As a group there is a wide variety of problems that may need to be addressed. It is also possible that there are several "paths" by which this type of offending behavior develops, and that when the subjects and samples are combined, multiple issues appear salient.

Mixed offense offenders appear to have the most pathology, at least insofar as being diagnosed as conduct disordered, hostile, impulsive, and uncooperative, and as having had severe social problems with peers. In general,

they appear to be the most likely of all three groups to be acting-out in a variety of areas. Their impulsivity, anxiety, academic problems, general uncooperativeness, and history of having received past psychological intervention may also increase the likelihood that organic factors are involved in at least some of these youth.

Combined Youth Sex Offenders

Data for all groups of youth sexual offenders combined are provided as a general profile of the population in Table 15. Because it combined the characteristics of all groups, it obviously made these youth appear even more troubled than they were, and in some cases variables got washed out by combining rates. Nevertheless, it may be of use as a starting place, or screening tool, when trying to identify an individual's treatment needs. It should be noted that sexual assault offenders often differed dramatically from these general findings.

Youth sexual offenders may be somewhat more likely to come from lower SES households, although they can obviously come from any strata. This may be an important treatment issue as low SES households are frequently the least able to afford the financial expense of treatment; therefore, intervention may be delayed until more people are victimized, problem behaviors get more severe, and/or treatment is court-ordered and finally paid for by the state.

Table 16

Clinically Relevant Characteristics of All OffendersCombined

Variable Subvariable	Percentage/SD Quality all (1 - 2)	
Socioeconomic Status:		
Lower (<\$15,000)	59/26	(58/29)
Referral Source:		
Self	65/43	(75/37)
Clinician	81/35	(79/38)
Juvenile Court	69/35	(74/31)
Parental Alcohol Abuse:		
Paternal	55/23	
Parental Drug Abuse:		
Paternal	62/09	
History of Child Physical Abuse:		
Maternal	52/27	(57/28)
Family Interaction Style (Adaptability):		
Chaotic/Rigid	68/34	(71/35)
Family Interaction Style (Cohesion):		
Enmeshed/ Disengaged	68/33	
History of Psychological Intervention:		
Sex Offense Related	55/37	(56/28)

(table continues)

Variable Subvariable	Percentage/SD Quality all (1 - 2)	
Academic Problems:		
Retained (1+ Grades	52/19	
Remedial Intervention	57/25	
Estimated IQ:		
85-115	67/19	
Lacks Social Skills with:		
Female Peers	60/33	(69/28)
Lacks Social Confidence with:		
Female Peers	80/35	
Male Peers	92/18	
Social Isolation from:		
Female Peers	72/28	
Male Peers	70/27	
General Affective:		
Hostility	67/27	
Social Anxiety	70/26	
General Cognitive:		
Uncooperative	64/38	(75/33)
General Nonsex Offenses:		
Other (Unspecified)	48/24	(52/17)
Offender's Age at First Offense:		
6-12 years	68/38	(75/36)
13-15 years	57/21	
First Victim's Age with Respect To Offender:		
Sig. Younger	72/28	

(table continues)

Variable Subvariable	Percentage/SD Quality all (1 - 2)	
Sex of First Victim:		
Female	73/24	(78/22)
Victim Age's with Respect of Offender:		
Sig. Younger	77/25	
Mixed	83/32	
Sex of Victims:		
Female	59/28	(63/25)
Mixed	50/42	(61/44)
Use of Pornography as a Sexual Stimulus:	53/37	(94/07)

Fathers are frequently reported to have alcohol and/or drug problems, and mothers may be physically abusive towards their children. Families frequently experience serious problems in terms of having positive coping skills and effective parenting (adaptability), as well as in providing appropriate emotional support and maintaining healthy boundaries (cohesion).

The youth offenders may be repeat offenders with a history of treatment for inappropriate sexual acting-out and may have had academic difficulties, as well as moderate to severe deficits in both the quality and frequency of social interactions with peers. Youth sexual offenders were often described as being overtly hostile, socially anxious, and uncooperative. A history of previous criminal activity was common.

Concerning sexual offenses, youth offenders tended to

commit their first offense between the ages of 6 and 12 years. The first victim was usually a female significantly younger than the offender; however, of those who committed more than a single offense (perhaps most), many offended against peers and older individuals, with as many as half victimizing males. Finally, pornography was frequently utilized as a sexual stimulus, even more so when only quality 1 and 2 samples are examined.

Treatment implications. Given the findings of this study, there is considerable evidence to suggest that treatment without fairly extensive assessment is not only unwise, but perhaps unethical. Youthful sex offenders do appear to be a fairly heterogeneous group in many respects, yet on the other hand, certain characteristics are more common to some subtypes than others. Furthermore, it cannot be ruled out that there are different paths by which the phenomenon develops, paths that once identified could potentially make treatment more effective and less costly by eliminating unnecessary treatment components.

The differences between subgroups of offenders, and the similarities within them, can be useful in the treatment setting. As noted by Becker (personal communication, February 1993), the assertiveness of sexual assault offenders can complement the emotional supportiveness of pedophilic youth in group settings. In addition, where certain treatment techniques and goals might be redundant,

or needless for some subgroups (e.g., social skills training with some sexual assault offenders), other subgroups could be separated and participate (mixed offense offenders). It is to be hoped that the results of this study will encourage clinicians and researchers to more systematically examine the similarities and differences among youth sex offenders.

Thus, with regards to the hypotheses set forth concerning the homogeneity of youth sex offenders, it appears that these youth both exhibit characteristics that are more consistently related to specific subgroups of offenders, and characteristics that are common across offense classifications. Table 17 provides a brief comparative summary of typological characteristics.

Table 17

A Comparative Summary of the Typological Characteristics for Three Subgroups
of Youth Sex Offenders

Type of Offender		
<u>Sexual Assault</u>	<u>Pedophilic</u>	<u>Mixed Offense</u>
<u>Offender Related Characteristics:</u>		
-Single parent (mother) headed family	-Low to Mid SES	-Lower SES
-Socially isolated from mother	-Father abuse of drugs	-Mother neglected as a child
-Father abuse of alcohol	-Mother physically abused as a child	-Maladaptive, dysfunctional family
-Uncooperative	-Maladaptive, dysfunctional family	-Frequently diagnosed with conduct disorder
	-Lacks social competence with male peers	-History of receiving psychological services
	-socially isolated from male/female peers	-Retained (1+ grades)
	-Hostile/impulsive	-Received remedial intervention
	-Victim of neglect/ sexual abuse	-Socially isolated from father
		-Lacks social skills with female/male peers
		-Lacks social confidence with female/male peers
		-Socially isolated from female/male peers

(table continues)

Type of Offender

Sexual Assault

Pedophilic

Mixed Offense

Offender Related Characteristics:

- Hostile
- Socially anxious
- Uncooperative
- History of nonsex criminal offenses
- Previous court appearances (charges dropped)

Offense Related Characteristics:

- First offense age 13-15 years
- First victim female
- Victimizes females of various ages
- Frequent use of pornography

- First offense age 6-12 years
- First victim significantly younger
- Victimizes significantly younger children (more often females than males)
- Uses verbal coercion to obtain compliance

- First offense age 6-12 years
- First victim significantly younger female
- Victimizes significantly younger children

CHAPTER 6

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study supported some of the common notions concerning youth sexual offenders and challenged others. For example, in generalizing from these findings it would appear that sexual assault offenders exhibit characteristics and have developmental histories that differ considerably from other youth sex offenders. They appear to be less overtly hostile, impulsive, anxious, and antisocial than other sex offenders; however, more covert forms of antisocial behavior remain to be addressed. Given the nature of the offenses these youth commit, it is very possible that other areas of private behavior differ considerably from what is more publicly perceived.

Sexual assault offenders exhibit more competent social behaviors with peers than do pedophilic youth, at least in the sense that they were able to, and more frequently did, engage in appropriate social behavior. These youth also tend to come from single parent families at unusually high rates, while at the same time they are socially isolated from mothers. This finding may have profound implications for both the development of sexual assault offending and effective intervention. How youth sexual assault offenders differ from adult offenders (and if they do, why do they) has not been addressed.

Pedophilic youth tend to have the most severe family

problems, and to be more hostile and impulsive than expected. They frequently exhibit notable problems in peer relationships, and may be socially isolated from fathers. While they are socially isolated as a group, this isolation may not be due to a deficit in their repertoire of social skills concerning peer relationships, but rather other factors such as motivation and opportunity. These youth also have the highest reported rates for animal cruelty of (although not significantly different from) all groups, and may be the most likely to be themselves victims of neglect and sexual abuse. This could have important implications concerning these youths' general perception about living creatures and people weaker than themselves.

Mixed offense offenders are probably the most pathological of all youth offenders. As with their sexual acting-out in multiple areas, they also exhibit a wide variety of other problems: conduct disorder, a history of requiring psychological services, family problems, and academic problems. These youth may require the most extensive assessment, as well as the most intensive forms of intervention.

History of parental neglect and physical abuse are fairly common to youth sex offenders. So is history of these youth being sexually abused by family members and others; however, the victim-to-victimizer link appears to be neither sufficient nor even necessary to the development of

sexually offending behavior in youth. This begs the question, "Where do youth learn sexually exploitive behavior?" This study cannot definitively answer this question, but it does suggest where researchers might begin looking. As a group, these youth do appear to experience a variety of events that might result in a kind of "premature sexualization," but not sexualization in terms of gender identity or gender consistency, or even in the sense that one knows the physical differences between males and females; in fact, not sexualization in the sense that the youth understands what intercourse or any other sexual activity is, or how it is conducted--rather, sexualization in the sense that sexual knowledge and behavior can be used to exploit others for personal gratification, or to intimidate and control, a knowledge that through sexual acting-out one can achieve a sense of self-efficacy, competence, and pleasure, albeit a temporary and distorted sense.

There is considerable evidence to support the notion that these youth tend to be impulsive, come from dysfunctional, nonsupportive families, are socially and academically frustrated, have a history of criminal offenses, and have been repeatedly seen in the mental health and/or juvenile court system. The combination of being prematurely sexualized (via pornography, sexual trauma, sexual abuse, etc.), personal and social frustrations, a low

sense of personal efficacy, and familial problems (for some in tandem with the onset of puberty and emerging sexual feelings) could set the stage for acting-out in a variety of areas--including sexually--just as these findings suggest is the case.

The form that youth sexual offending takes (assaultive, pedophilic, etc.) is probably dependent upon many antecedents, and may take a variety of different developmental paths. The multiple characteristics and wide variability between samples, presented in this study, indeed suggest that this needs to be examined more closely. Perhaps this indicates that while intervention programs may be able to include a limited number of treatment foci for all youth sex offenders, and perhaps more for similar subgroups of offenders, they will probably have to be relatively individualized to address key treatment needs.

Although this study did not directly address recidivism following intervention, the large percentage of reporting subjects with a history of previous treatment for sexual offending (from nearly 40 to over 60%) warrants serious concern for treatment efficacy, at least for programs established since the early 1980s. If variability in individual treatment needs is wide, as suggested here, then programs that "rubber-stamp" youth offenders with identical, or nearly so, treatment regimens may be those with the poorest outcome.

These implications do not discount the usefulness of treatment adjuncts, such as the relapse prevention programs developed by Laws (1989) and colleagues, but rather concern the etiological factors in the development of sexually offensive behavior. In fact, until the empirical research on etiological factors, theory, and treatment has been conducted, programs that prescribe maintenance of appropriate sexual behavior may be the most successful intervention because they focus on coping skills and tend to be highly flexible.

Recommendations for Future Research

This study combined data from 140 samples and over 16,000 individual subjects. The findings support some of the popular notions about the phenomenon of youth sexual offending, contradict others, and effectively demonstrate that much remains to be learned. Several recommendations for future research are made.

The first recommendation has to do with empirical confirmation for the results presented here. Very few of the studies examined in this analysis had, as their primary goal, the conceptualization of the offender and his offense history. This, unfortunately, resulted in a deficit in terms of complete data being available. For example, studies frequently reported that X% of their sample had a known history of being physically abused, but rarely did

they report the percentage that had a known history of not being physically abused. Simply assuming that 100-X is the percentage of offenders without a history of physical abuse would be inaccurate and irresponsible. Therefore, more primary research needs to be conducted with the explicit goal of learning more about the developmental history of the youth sex offender and the relationship to his offenses.

Akin to the above recommendation is one concerning how different subgroups of sex offenders are defined. Clearly conceptualized and operationalized criteria for sexual assault offenders and pedophilic youth need to be developed. DSM-III-R (APA, 1987) criteria will not suffice because there is no diagnosis for sexual assault offender, and differences between the pedophilic youth, and his victim, are more a feature of physical and emotional development than years. Furthermore, how does one classify a 15-year-old who rapes a 10-year-old? As a sexual assault offender, a child molester, or both? Criteria are presently based upon the researcher's opinion, not upon easily identifiable offense features. Once criteria are established, then more consistent groups of offenders can be identified and researched, and results can be compared with other studies.

The third recommendation concerns female youth sex offenders. As mentioned in the introduction, there is growing concern that female sex offenders, including youth offenders, may be neither rare, nor their offenses harmless.

Research should be initiated to develop and test conceptual models for these offenders so that an accurate understanding and empirically derived interventions can be developed.

The fourth recommendation is a repeat of Davis and Leitenberg's (1987), i.e., we still do not really understand if and how these youth differ, either from other groups of delinquent youth not offending sexually, or from nonoffending youth. Although some efforts have been initiated in this direction recently (e.g., Blaske et al., 1989), much remains to be done. This study has hopefully helped to integrate data from various subgroups of youth sex offenders, and will contribute to this process.

The fifth and final recommendation is that, given the variety of intervention programs nationwide, a meta-analysis of treatment programs and outcomes should be conducted to determine those approaches and techniques that appear to have the best long-term outcome. These data could be combined with findings from the conceptual and theoretical research to increase understanding as to how and why some approaches work better or worse than others. These findings would assist the practitioner in determining which approaches would be most effective for which offenders.

Sexual offenses perpetrated by youth continue to be a national concern. Despite a near exponential increase in public attention and in the number of treatment programs, the incidence of offenders, offenses, and victims continues

to increase at alarmingly high rates. Treatment of these youth is, unquestionably, of paramount importance. Without a doubt it is the best "prevention" measure potential victims could be provided, as well as the best means to help these youth lead productive lives. However, understanding is the key to effective treatment, and it is hoped that this study has made a contribution in that respect.

REFERENCES

- Able, G. G., Barlow, D. H., Blanchard, E. B., & Guild, D. (1977). The components of rapists' sexual arousal. Archives of General Psychiatry, 34 895-903.
- Able, G. G., Becker, J. V., Cunningham-Rathner, J., Mittleman, M., & Rouleau, J. L. (1988). Multiple paraphilic diagnoses among sex offenders. Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatry Law, 6, 153-168.
- Able, G. G., Becker, J. V., Mittleman, M., Cunningham-Rathner, J., Rouleau, J. L., & Murphy, W. D. (1987). Self-reported sex crimes of nonincarcerated paraphiliacs. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 2, 3-25.
- Able, G. G., Becker, J. V., Murphy, W. D., & Flanagan, B. (1981). Identifying dangerous child molesters. In R. B. Stuart (Ed.), Violent behavior: Social learning approaches to prediction, management, and treatment (pp. 116-137). New York: Brunner/Mazel.
- Ageton, S. S. (1983). Sexual assault among adolescents. Lexington, MA: Lexington.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1987). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders-revised (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.
- American Psychiatric Association. (1980). Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental disorders (3rd ed.). Washington, DC: Author.

- Anderson, W. P., Kuncze, J. T., & Rich, B. (1979). Sex offenders: Three personality types. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 25, 671-676.
- Anechiarco, B. (1990). Understanding and treating sex offenders from a self-psychological perspective: The missing piece. Clinical Social Work Journal, 18, 281-292.
- Armentrout, J. A., & Hauer, A. L. (1978). MMPI's of rapists of adults, rapists of children, and non-rapist sex offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 34, 330-332.
- Ascione, F. R. (1993). Children who are cruel to animals: A review of research and implications for developmental psychopathology. Anthrozoos, 6, in press.
- Bakeman, R., & Gottman, J. M. (1989). Observing interaction: An introduction to sequential analysis. Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press.
- Bangert-Downs, R. L. (1986). Review of developments in meta-analytic method. Psychological Reports, 99, 388-399.
- Baxter, D. J., Marshall, W. L., Barbaree, H. E., Davidson, P. R., & Malcom, R. B. (1984). Deviant sexual behavior: Differentiating sex offenders by criminal and personal history, psychometric measures, and sexual response. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 11, 477-501.

- Becker, J. V., & Abel, G. G. (1985). Methodological and ethical issues in evaluating and treating adolescent sexual offenders. In E. M. Otey & G. D. Ryan (Eds.), Adolescent sex offenders: Issues in research and treatment. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.
- Becker, J. V., Cunningham-Rathner, J., & Kaplan, M. S. (1986a). Adolescent sexual offenders: Demographics, criminal and sexual histories, and recommendations for reducing future offenses. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1, 431-445.
- Becker, J. V., Hunter, J. A., Stein, R. M., & Kaplan, M. S. (1989). Factors associated with erection in adolescent sex offenders. Journal of Psychopathology and Behavioral Assessment, 11, 353-362.
- Becker, J. V., Kaplan, M. S., Cunningham-Rathner, J., & Kavoussi, R. (1986b). Characteristics of adolescent incest sexual perpetrators: Preliminary findings. Journal of Family Violence, 1, 85-97.
- Becker, J. V., Kaplan, M. S., & Kavoussi, R. (1988). Measuring the effectiveness of treatment for the aggressive adolescent sexual offender. Annals of the New York Academy of Science, 528, 215-222.

- Becker, J. V., Kaplan, M. S., Tenke, C. E., & Tartaglini, A. (1991). The incidence of depressive symptomology in juvenile sex offenders with a history of abuse. Child Abuse and Neglect, 15, 531-536.
- Bengis, S. M. (1986). A comprehensive service-delivery system with a continuum of care for adolescent sexual offenders. Orwell, VT: The Safer Society Press.
- Berach, E. F., & Myers, R. G. (1983). The offense records of a sample of convicted exhibitionists. American Academy of Psychiatry and Law Bulletin, 11, 365-369.
- Betha-Jackson, G., & Brissett-Chapman, S. (1989). The juvenile sex offender: Challenges to assessment for outpatient intervention. Child and Adolescent Social Work Journal, 6, 127-137.
- Bischof, G. P., & Stith, S. M. (1991). Adolescent male sexual offenders perceptions of their family characteristics. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council on Family Relations, Denver, CO.
- Blaske, D. M., Borduin, C. M., Henggler, S. W., & Mann B. J. (1989). Individual, family and peer characteristics of adolescent sex offenders and assaultive offenders. Developmental Psychology, 25, 846-855.
- Bliss, E. L., & Larson, E. M. (1985). Sexual criminality and hypnotizability. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 173, 522-526.

- Bradford, J. M. W., Bloomberg, D., & Bourget, D. (1988). The heterogeneity/homogeneity of pedophilia. Psychiatric Journal of the University of Ottawa, 13, 217-226.
- Brickman, A. S., McManus, M., Grapentine, W. L. & Alessi, N. (1984). Neuropsychological assessment of seriously delinquent adolescents. Journal of the American Academy of Child Psychiatry, 23, 453-457.
- Breer, W. (1987). The adolescent molester. Springfield, IL: Thomas Books.
- Burgess, A. W., Hartman, C. R., McCormack, A., & Grant, C. A. (1988a). Child victim to juvenile victimizer: Treatment implications. International Journal of Family Psychiatry, 9, 403-416.
- Burgess, A. W., Hazlewood, R. R., Rokous, F. E., Hartman, C. R., & Burgess, A. G. (1988b). Serial rapists and their victims: Reenactment and repetition. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 528, 277-295.
- Cohen, J. (1990). Things I have learned (so far). American Psychologist, 45, 1304-1312.
- Cohen, J. M., Seghorn, T., & Calmas, W. (1969). Sociometric study of the sex offender. Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 74(2), 249-255.
- Conte, J. R., Wolf, S., & Smith, T. (1989). What sexual offenders tell us about prevention strategies. Child Abuse and Neglect, 13, 293-301.

- Cooper, A. J., Swaminath, S., Baxter, D., & Poulin, C.
(1990). A female sex offender with multiple paraphilias:
A psychologic, physiologic (laboratory sexual arousal)
and endocrine case study. Canadian Journal of
Psychiatry, 35, 334-337.
- Crime in Utah (1990). Department of public safety. Uniform
Crime Reporting Service, Salt Lake City, UT.
- Cunningham, C., & MacFarlane, K. (1988). A 12-step program
for young offenders (5-12) and their families.
Conference presentation at the National Training
Conference: Implementing and Intervention Continuum for
the Youthful Offender, Long Beach, CA.
- Davis, G. E., & Leitenberg, H. (1987). Adolescent sex
offenders. Psychological Bulletin, 101(3), 417-427.
- Deisher, R. W., Wenet, G. A., Paperny, D. M., Clark, T. F.,
& Fehrenbach, P. A. (1982). Adolescent sexual offense
behavior: The role of the physician. Journal of
Adolescent Health Care, 2, 279-286.
- DeJong, A. R. (1989). Sexual interactions among siblings
and cousins: Experimentation or exploitation? Child
Abuse and Neglect, 13, 271-279.
- Department of Health and Human Services. (1985). Adolescent
sex offenders--Vermont, 1984. Morbidity Weekly Report,
34, 738-741.

- Dutton, W. A., & Newlon, B. J. (1988). Early recollections and sexual fantasies of adolescent sex offenders. Individual Psychology Journal of Alderian Theory, Research and Practice, 44, 85-94.
- Dwyer, S. M. (1988). Exhibitionism/Voyeurism. [Special issue: The sexually unusual: Guide to understanding and helping]. Journal of Social Work and Human Sexuality, 7, 101-112.
- Dwyer, S. M., & Amberson, J. I. (1989). Behavioral patterns and personality characteristics of 56 sex offenders: A preliminary study. Journal of Psychology and Human Sexuality, 2, 105-118.
- English, D. J., Henderson, J., & Nakagawa, J. (1991a). A description of the characteristics and services provided to sexually aggressive youth served in Division of Youth and Family Services programs. (Available from the Children's Services Research Unit, Department of Social and Health Services, Olympia, WA.)
- English, D. J., & Nakagawa, J. (1991b). A description of sexually aggressive youth referred to the SAY Treatment Project compared to sexually aggressive youth not referred. (Available from the Children's Services Research Unit, Department of Social and Health Services, Olympia, WA.)

- Fagan, J., & Wexler, S. (1988). Explanations of sexual assault among violent delinquents [Special issue: Adolescent Sexual behavior]. Journal of Adolescent Research, 3, 363-385.
- Fehrenbach, P. A., & Monastersky, C. (1988). Characteristics of the female adolescent sexual offender. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 58, 148-151.
- Fehrenbach, P. A., Smith, W., Monastersky, C., & Deisher, R. W. (1986). Adolescent sexual offenders: Offender and offense characteristics. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 56(2), 225-233.
- Finklehor, D. (1986). A sourcebook on child sexual abuse. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Freeman-Longo, R. E. (1986). The impact of sexual victimization on males. Child Abuse and Neglect, 19, 411-414.
- Freund, K., Watson, R., & Dickey, R. (1990). Does sexual abuse in childhood cause pedophilia: An exploratory study. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 19, 557-568.
- Friedrich, W. N., & Luecke, W. J. (1988). Young school age sexually aggressive children. Professional Psychology Research and Practice, 19, 155-164.
- Gilby, R., Wolf, L., & Goldberg, B. (1989). Mentally retarded adolescent sex offenders: A survey and pilot study. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 34, 542-548.

- Gilgun, J. F. (1990). Rapists and their mothers. Paper presented at the National Council on Family Relations, Seattle, WA.
- Glass, G. (1976). Primary, secondary and meta-analysis of research. Educational Researcher, 5, 3-8.
- Glass, G. (1977). Integrating findings: The meta-analysis of research. Review of Research in Education, 5, 351-379.
- Glass, G., McGraw, B., & Smith, M. L. (1981). Meta-analysis in social research. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Gomez-Schwartz, B., Horowitz, J., & Cardarelli, A. P. (1988). Child sexual abuse victims and their treatment. Bureau of Justice Statistics, U.S. Department of Justice. Rockville, MD: Justice Statistics Clearinghouse.
- Graves, R. B. (1992). Conceptualizing the youthful sex offender: A meta-analytic examination of offender characteristics. Unpublished pilot study, Utah State University, Logan, UT.
- Graves, R. B., Openshaw, D. K., & Adams, G. R. (1992). Adolescent sex offenders and social skills training. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 36, 139-153.
- Groth, N. A. (1977). The adolescent sexual offender and his prey. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 21(2), 249-254.

- Groth, N. A., & Birnbaum, H. J. (1978). Adult sexual orientation and attraction to underage persons. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 7, 175-181.
- Groth, N. A., Longo, R. E., & McFadin, J. B. (1982). Undetected recidivism among rapists and child molesters. Crime and Delinquency, 28, 450-458.
- Haines, A. A., Herrman, L., Baker, K., & Gaber, S. (1986). The development of a psycho-educational group program for adolescent sex offenders. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services & Rehabilitation, 11, 398-406.
- Hall, G. C. N. (1980). Self-reported hostility as a function of offense characteristics and response style in a sexual offender population. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 57, 306-308.
- Hall, G. C. N., Proctor, W. C., & Nelson, G. M. (1988). Validity of physiological measures of pedophilic sexual arousal in a sexual offender population. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 56, 118-122.
- Heinz, J. W., Gargaro, S., & Kelley, K. G. (1987). A model residential juvenile sex-offender treatment program. The Hennepin County Home School. Syracuse, NY: Safer Society Press.

- Henderson, J. E., English, D. J., & Mackenzie, W. R. (1989). Family centered casework practice with sexually aggressive children [Special issue: Treatment of sex offenders in social work and mental health settings]. Journal of Social Work and Human Sexuality, 7, 89-108.
- Hendricks, S. E., Fitzpatrick, D. F., Hartmann, K., Quaife, M. A., Stratbucker, R. A., & Graber, B. (1988). Brain structure and function in sexual molesters of children and adolescents. Journal of Clinical Psychiatry, 49, 108-112.
- Hollin, C., & Howells, K. (Eds.) (1991). Clinical approaches to sex offenders and their victims. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hunter, J., & Santos, D. (1990). The use of specialized cognitive-behavioral therapies in the treatment of adolescent sexual offenders. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 34, 239-247.
- Johnson, T. C. (1988). Child perpetrators--children who molest other children: Preliminary findings. Child Abuse and Neglect, 12, 219-229.
- Johnston, F. A., & Johnston, S. A. (1986). Differences between human figure drawings of child molesters and control groups. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 42, 638-647.

- Kahn, T. J., & Lafond, M. A. (1988). Treatment of the adolescent sex offender. Child and Adolescent Social Work, 5(2), 135-148.
- Kaplan, M. S., Able, G. G., Cunningham-Rathner, J., & Mittleman, M. S. (1990). The impact of parolees' perception of confidentiality of their self-reported sex crimes. Annals of Sex Research, 3, 293-303.
- Kaplan, M. S., Becker, J. V., & Martinez, D. F. (1990). A comparison of mothers of adolescent incest vs. non-incest perpetrators. Journal of Family Violence, 5, 209-214.
- Kaplan, M. S., Becker, J. V., & Tenke, C. E. (1991a). Assessment of sexual knowledge and attitudes in an adolescent sex offender population. Journal of Sex Education and Therapy, 17, 217-225.
- Kaplan, M. S., Becker, J. V., & Tenke, C. E. (1991b). Influence of abuse history on male adolescent self-reported comfort with interviewer gender. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 6, 3-11.
- Kavoussi, R. J., Kaplan, M., & Becker, J. V. (1988). Psychiatric diagnosis in adolescent sex offenders. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 27, 241-243.
- Kempton, T., & Forehand, R. (1992). Juvenile sex offenders: Similar to or different from other incarcerated delinquent offenders? Behavior Research and Therapy, 30, 533-536.

- Knopp, F. H. (1982). Remedial intervention in adolescent sex offenders: Nine program descriptions. New York: Safer Society Press.
- Knopp, F. H., & Lackey, L. B. (1987). Female sexual abusers: A summary of data from 44 treatment providers. Orwell, VT: Safer Society Press.
- Laben, J. K., Dodd, D., & Sneed, L. (1991). King's theory of goal attainment applied in group therapy for inpatient juvenile sexual offenders, maximum security state offenders, and community parolees, using visual aids [Special issue: Psychiatric nursing for the 1990's: New concepts, new therapies]. Issues in Mental Health Nursing, 12, 51-64.
- Lang, R. A., Lloyd, C. A., & Figia, N. A. (1985). Goal attainment scaling with hospitalized sexual offenders. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 173, 527-537.
- Langevin, R., Wright, P., & Handy, L. (1989). Characteristics of sex offenders who were sexually victimized as children. Annals of Sex Research, 2 227-253.
- Lanyon, R.I. (1986). Theory and treatment in child molestation. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54(2), 176-182.
- Laws, D.R. (1989). Relapse prevention with sex offenders. New York: The Guilford Press.

- Leahey, T., & Harris, R. (1989). Human learning. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Lee, C. M., & Allen, C. M. (1991). Family structure and intra/extrafamilial sexual victimization experienced by female and male offenders when they were children. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of the National Council of Family Relations, Denver, CO.
- Levin, S. M., & Stava, L. (1987). Personality characteristics of sex offenders: A review. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 16(1), 57-76.
- Lewis, D. O., Shankok, S. S., & Pincus, J. H. (1979). Juvenile male sexual assaulters. American Journal of Psychiatry, 136, 1194-1196.
- Longo, R. E. (1982). Sexual learning and experience among adolescent sexual offenders. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 26(3), 235-241.
- Longo, R. E., & Groth, N. A., (1983). Juvenile sexual offenses in the histories of adult rapists and child molesters. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 27, 150-155.
- Longo, R. E., & McFadin, B. (1981). Sexually inappropriate behavior: Development of the sexual offender. Law and Order, 21-23.

- Margolin, L. (1984). Group therapy as a means of learning about the sexually assaultive adolescent. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 28, 65-72.
- Marshall, W. L. (1988). The use of sexually explicit stimuli by rapists, child molesters, and nonoffenders. Journal of Sex Research, 25, 267-288.
- Matthews, R., Matthews, J. K., & Speltz, K. (1989). Female sexual offenders: An exploratory study. Orwell, VT: Safer Society Press.
- Matthews, R. (1987). Female sexual offenders: Program for healthy adolescent sexual expression. Adolescent Perpetrator Network 3rd National Meeting, Keystone, CO.
- McConaghy, N., Armstrong, M. S., & Blaszczyński, A. (1985). Expectancy, covert sensitization and imaginal desensitization in compulsive sexual acts. ACTA Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 72, 176-187.
- McConaghy, N., Blaszczyński, A., Armstrong, M. S., & Kidson, W. (1989). Resistance to treatment of adolescent sex offenders. Archives of Sexual Behavior, 18, 97-107.
- McConaghy, N., Blaszczyński, A., & Kidson, W. (1988). Treatment of sex offenders with imaginal desensitization and/or medroxyprogesterone. ACTA Psychiatrica Scandinavica, 77, 199-206.

- McCraw, R. K., & Pegg-McNab, J. (1989). Rorschach comparisons of male juvenile sex offenders and nonsex offenders. Journal of Personality Assessment, 53, 546-553.
- Mio, J. S., Nanjundappa, G., Verleur, D. E., & deRios, M. D. (1986). Drug abuse and the adolescent sex offender: A preliminary analysis [Special issue: Drug dependency and the family]. Journal of Psychoactive Drugs, 18, 65-72.
- Morolla, J., & Scully, D. (1986). Attitudes toward women, violence and rape: A comparison of convicted rapists and other felons. Deviant Behavior, 7, 337-355.
- Mrasek, D. A. (1983). Long-term follow-up of an adolescent perpetrator of sexual abuse. Child Abuse and Neglect, 7, 239-240.
- National Adolescent Perpetrators Network. (1988). National training conference: Implementing an intervention continuum for the youthful sexual offender, Long Beach, CA.
- National Institute of Mental Health (NIMH). (1985). Adolescent sex offenders: Issues in research and treatment. (DHHS Pub. NO. ADM 85-1396). Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Network on Juveniles Offending Sexually (NOJOS). (1989). The Utah report on juvenile sex offenders. The Utah Task Force of the Utah Network on Juveniles Offending Sexually, Price, Utah.

- O'Brien, M. (1982). Adolescent sexual offenders: A community faces reality. [Special issue: Sexually exploited children]. Change, A Juvenile Justice Quarterly, V, 16-18.
- Olsen, D. H., Russell, C. S., & Sprenkle D. H.. (1980). Circumplex model of marital and family systems, II: Empirical studies and clinical intervention. Advances in Family Intervention, Assessment, and Theory, 1, 129-179.
- Overholser, J. C., & Beck, S. (1986). Multimethod assessment of rapists, child molesters, and three control groups on behavioral and psychological measures. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 54(5), 682-687.
- Petrovich, M., & Templer, D. I. (1984). Heterosexual molestation of children who later become rapists. Psychological Reports, 54, 810.
- Pettis, K. W., & Hughes, R. D. (1985). Sexual victimization of children: A current perspective. Behavioral Disorders, 10, 136-144.
- Pierce, L. H., & Pierce, R. L. (1987). Incestuous victimization by juvenile sex offenders. Journal of Family Violence, 2, 351-364.
- Pithers, W. D., Kashima, K. M., Cummings, G. F., Beal, L. S., & Buell, M. M. (1988). Relapse prevention of sexual aggression. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 528, 244-260.
- Pontius, A. A. (1988). Limbic system-frontal lobes' role in

- subtypes of "atypical rape." Psychological Reports, 63, 879-888.
- Porter, S. (1990). Adolescent sex offenders: A study of the relationship between self-concept and sexual behavior in adolescent males. American Journal of Forensic Psychology, 8, 61-73.
- Prendergast, W. E. (1979). The sex offender: How to spot him before it's too late. Sexology, 46, 46-51.
- Prentky, R. A., & Carter, D. (1984). The predictive value of the triad for sex offenders. Behavioral Sciences and the Law, 2, 341-354.
- Prentky, R. A., Cohen, M., & Seghorn, T. (1985). Development of a rational taxonomy for the classification of sexual offenders: Rapists. Bulletin of the American Academy of Psychiatric Law, 13, 39-70.
- Prentky, R. A., & Knight, R. A. (1986). Impulsivity in the lifestyle and criminal behavior of sexual offenders. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 13, 141-164.
- Prentky, R. A., Knight, R. A., & Rosenberg, R. (1988). Validation analyses on a taxonomic system for rapists: Disconfirmation and reconceptualization. Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 528, 21-40.
- Prentky, R. A., Knight, R. A., Sims-Knight, J. E., Straus, H., Rokous, F., & Cerce, D. (1989). Developmental antecedents of sexual aggression. Development and Psychopathology, 1, 153-169.

- Quinsey, V. L. (1977). The assessment and treatment of child molesters: A review. Canadian Psychological Review, 18(3), 204-220.
- Ressler, R. K., Burgess, A. W., Hartman, C. R., Douglass, J. E., & McCormack, A. (1986). Murderers who rape and mutilate. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 1, 273-287.
- Rotheram-Borus, M. J., Becker, J. V., Koopman, C., & Kaplan, M. S. (1991). AIDS knowledge and beliefs, and sexual behavior of sexually delinquent and non-delinquent (runaway) adolescents. Journal of Adolescence, 14, 229-244.
- Ryan, G. (1989). Victim to victimizer: Rethinking victim treatment. Journal of Interpersonal Violence, 4, 324-341.
- Ryan, G., Lane, S., Davis, J., & Issac C. (1987). Juvenile sex offenders: Development and correction. [Special Issue] Child Abuse and Neglect, 11, 385-395.
- Saunders, E. B., & Awad, G. A. (1988). Assessment, management, and treatment planning for male adolescent sexual offenders. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 58, 571-579.
- Saunders, E. B., & Awad, G. A. (1991). Male adolescent sexual offenders: Exhibitionism and obscene phone calls. Child Psychiatry and Human Development, 21, 169-178.

- Saunders, E. B., Awad, G. A., & White, G. (1986). Male adolescent sexual offenders: The offender and the offense. [Special issue: Canadian Academy of Child Psychiatry: A Canadian perspective]. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 31, 542-549.
- Scavo, R. R. (1989). Female adolescent sex offenders: A neglected treatment group. Social Casework: The Journal of Contemporary Social Work, 70, 114-117.
- Scavo, R., & Buchanan, B. D. (1989). Group therapy for male adolescent sex offenders: A model for residential treatment. Residential Treatment for Children and Youth, 7, 59-74.
- Segal, Z. V., & Marshall, W. L. (1985). Heterosexual social skills in a population of rapists and child molesters. Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology, 53(1), 55-63.
- Segal, Z. V., & Marshall, W. L. (1986). Discrepancies between self-efficacy predictions and actual performance in a population of rapists and child molesters. Cognitive therapy and Research, 10, 363-376.
- Seghorn, T. K., Prentky, R. A., & Boucher, R. J. (1987). Childhood sexual abuse in the lives of sexually aggressive offenders. Journal of the American Academy of Child and Adolescent Psychiatry, 26, 262-267.

- Seltzer, A., & Langford, A. (1984). Forensic psychiatric assessments in the Northwest Territories. Canadian Journal of Psychiatry, 29, 665-668.
- Shoor, M., Speed, M. H., & Bartlet, C. (1966). Syndrome of the adolescent child molester. American Journal of Psychiatry, 122, 783-789.
- Smets, A. C., & Cebula, C. M. (1987). A group treatment program for adolescent sex offenders: Five steps toward resolution. Child Abuse and Neglect, 11, 247-254.
- Smith, W. R. (1988). Delinquency and abuse among juvenile sex offenders. Unpublished manuscript, University of Washington, Division of Adolescent Medicine.
- Smith, W. R., & Monastersky, C. (1986). Assessing juvenile sex offenders' risk for reoffending. Criminal Justice and Behavior, 13, 115-140.
- Smith, W. R., Monastersky, C., & Deisher, R. M. (1987). MMPI-based personality types among juvenile sexual offenders. Journal of Clinical Psychology, 43, 422-430.
- Stenson, P., & Anderson, C. (1987). Treating juvenile sex offenders and preventing the cycle of abuse. Journal of Child Care, 3, 91-102.
- Stermac, L., & Hall, K. (1989). Escalation in sexual offending: Fact or fiction? Annals of Sex Research, 2, 153-162.

Stevenson, H. C., Castillo, E., & Sefarbi, R. (1989).

Treatment of denial in adolescent sex offenders and their families. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services and Rehabilitation, 14, 37-50.

Sugar, M. (1983). Sexual abuse of children and adolescents. Adolescent Psychiatry, 11, 199-211.

Tarter, R. E., Hegedus, A. M., Alterman, A. I. & Katz-Garris, L. (1983). Cognitive capacities of juvenile violent, nonviolent, and sexual offenders. The Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 12, 564-567.

Tingle, D., Barnard, G. W., Robbins, L., Newman, G., & Hutchinson, D. (1986). Childhood and adolescent characteristics of pedophiles and rapists. International Journal of Law and Psychiatry, 9, 103-116.

U.S. Department of Justice (1990). Uniform crime reports, Federal Bureau of Investigation. Washington, DC: US Government Printing Office.

VanNess, S. R. (1984). Rape as instrumental violence: A study of youth offenders. [Special issue: Gender issues, sex offenses, and criminal justice: Current trends]. Journal of Offender Counseling, Services, and Rehabilitation, 9, 161-170.

Vinogradov, S., Dishotsky, N., Doty, A. K., & Tinklenberg, J. R. (1988). Patterns of behavior in adolescent rape. American Journal of Orthopsychiatry, 58, 179-187.

Weil, J. (1989). Instinctual stimulation of children: From common practice to child abuse (Volume 1: Clinical findings). Madison, CT: International University Press.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A:
DEFINITION OF TERMS

APPENDIX A
DEFINITION OF TERMS

Exhibitionism - A DSM-III-R (American Psychiatric Association [APA], 1987) paraphilia whereby over a period of at least six months one has intense and recurrent urges and sexually arousing fantasies that involve exposing one's genitals to unsuspecting strangers. Although this disorder is thought to usually develop in childhood, it is rarely diagnosed prior to age 18. Because of the relatively young age of the samples in this study, a DSM-III-R diagnosis of exhibitionism is not required for inclusion into the exhibitionism subtype sample. Behavior consistent with this diagnosis that does not meet the criteria for pedophilia (see below) is sufficient.

Juvenile or youth sex offender - For the purpose of this study a juvenile or youthful sex offender is a male between the ages of 5 and 18 who meets diagnostic and/or legal criteria for the commission of a sexual offense. Because sexual offending has only recently been recognized as occurring, albeit infrequently, prior to puberty, the majority of the samples pooled in this study will be of individuals between the ages of approximately 12 and 18 years.

Mixed sex offense offender - Sample subjects who meet this subtype criteria are individuals who have committed two

or more types of sexual offenses (e.g., sexual assault and voyeurism). Furthermore, studies that classify their samples as general or undifferentiated sex offenders will be loaded under this subtype heading.

Pedophilia (Pedophilic) - A DSM-III-R diagnosis (APA, 1987) paraphilia whereby over a period of at least six months one has intense and recurrent urges and sexually arousing fantasies that involve sexual activity with a prepubescent child. This disorder usually begins during adolescence, yet by convention diagnosis is not made in persons younger than 16 years. For inclusion into this group subtype a diagnosis of pedophilia is not necessary. Studies describing their samples as child molesters, pedophiles or pedophilic-like are included here. This criteria usually requires that the offender exhibits a pattern of sexual acting-out with children at least three to five years younger than he or she. Victims may be the same or opposite sex of the perpetrator, or both. Incest offenses may or may not be categorized as pedophilic.

Sample - Study samples are the unit of interest in this project. Individual subject characteristics within the sample determine its group or subgroup placement (e.g., nonoffending, conduct disordered, sex offender), but because individual subject data is only rarely provided (and only when the sample size is very small) analyses will only involve the sample's summary statistics.

Sexual assault offense - A sexual offense where the offender obtains victim compliance by using physical force, threats of violence or similar means. Rape and attempted rape are the most frequently reported behaviors in this subtype of sex offenses.

Voyeurism - A DSM-III-R (APA, 1987) paraphilia whereby over a period of at least six months one has intense and recurrent urges and sexually arousing fantasies that involve observing an unsuspecting person who is naked, in the process of disrobing, or engaging in sexual activity. Although onset of this disorder is usually thought to occur prior to age 15, diagnosis is rare before adulthood (APA, 1987). Diagnosis is not required for inclusion into the voyeurism group subtype. Behavior consistent with this diagnosis that fails to meet the criteria for pedophilia is sufficient.

APPENDIX B

VARIABLES IMPLICATED IN YOUTHFUL SEX
OFFENDING AS NOTED IN THE LITERATURE

APPENDIX B

VARIABLES IMPLICATED IN YOUTHFUL SEX

OFFENDING AS NOTED IN THE LITERATURE

Table 18

Summary of Variables Clinically Implicated in Youthful Sexual
Offending as Noted in Literature Reviews (Not Exhaustive)

Category/ Variable	Percentages Observed by Variable		
	Davis & Leitenberg (1987)	Quinsey (1977)	Saunders & Awad (1988)
<u>Age of Victim to Offender:</u>			
Younger	62+		
Peer	*		
Older	*		
<u>Sex of Victim:</u>			
Female	68-96		
Male	9-63		
<u>Offender Relationship:</u>			
Known by Victim	55-75		
Unknown	9-48		
<u>Level of Coercion:</u>			
Physical force/ weapon	43		
Verbal threat	57		
<u>Racial Differences:</u>			
White	42-74		
Black	24-58		

(table continues)

Percentages Observed by Variable

Category/ Variable	Davis & Leitenberg (1987)	Quinsey (1977)	Saunders & Awad (1988)
<u>Family</u>			
<u>Environment:</u>			
Intrafamily violence	79		*
Punitive parenting	*		
<u>Social</u>			
<u>Adjustment:</u>			
Socially isolated	65		*
Low social skills	*	*	
<u>Psychological</u>			
<u>Adjustment:</u>			
Conduct disturbances	41-86	*	*
Academic problems	53-78		*
Psychiatric history	*		*
<u>History of</u>			
<u>Victimization:</u>			
Physical	41-75		*
Sexual	19-47		*
<u>Sexual</u>			
<u>History:</u>			
Consenting genital contact	59-86		

Note. The percentages noted are approximates and are not broken down by subtype of offender. More detailed figures are available in the actual reviews. * Indicates that the variable is implicated in offending, but no actual percentage was noted.

APPENDIX C
CODING FORM

APPENDIX C
CODING FORM

ASOMAV3.DAT

1

Conceptualizing the Youthful Sex Offender: A Meta-Analytic
Examination of Offender Characteristics
(Sex Offender; Version 3, ASOMAV3.DAT)

COLUMN	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
1-2	01	Record (Demographics 1)
3-5	--	Article Code Number
7-8	--	Year of Publication
10-12	--	Total N
14	--	Subtype Code (1 Sexual assault, 2 Pedophilic, 3 Exhibitionism, 4 Voyeurism, 5 Other/mixed (specify) _____.)
16-18	--	Subtype n
20	--	Quality of Source (1 Good, 2 Average, 3 poor)

Unless otherwise noted, all entries represent the proportion of the
subtype (above) meeting each particular criteria.

A. General Demographics

		Family Type:
22-23	--	Biological Parents
25-26	--	Blended
28-29	--	Single Parents
31-32	--	Foster Parents (Other)
		Ethnicity:
34-35	--	Caucasian
37-38	--	Black
40-41	--	Hispanic
43-44	--	Oriental
46-47	--	Amer. Indian
49-50	--	Mixed (Other)
		SES/Income:
52-53	--	Upper (\$60,000+)
55-56	--	Middle (15,000-59,999)
58-59	--	Lower (14,999 & below)

1-2	02	Record (Demographics 2)
3-5	--	Article Code Number

B. Parental Education

		Maternal Education Level:
7-8	--	<= 6th Grade
10-11	--	<= 9th Grade
13-14	--	High school Grad.
16-17	--	<= 2 years College
19-20	--	4-year College Grad.
22-23	--	Graduate School

ASOMAV3.DAT

2

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
<hr/>		
		Paternal Education Level:
25-26	--	</= 6th Grade
28-29	--	</= 9th Grade
31-32	--	High school Grad.
34-35	--	</= 2 years College
37-38	--	4-year College Grad.
40-41	--	Graduate School
<hr/>		
<u>C. Family Religious Orientation</u>		
<hr/>		
		Religious Affiliation:
43-44	--	Catholic
46-47	--	Protestant (not Mormon)
49-50	--	Jewish
52-53	--	Mormon
55-56	--	Muslim
58-59	--	Eastern Orthodox
61-62	--	Mixed (Other)
64-65	--	None
<hr/>		
		Degree of Activity:
67-68	--	High
70-71	--	Moderate
73-74	--	Low
76-77	--	Inactive
<hr/>		
1-2	03	Record (Demographics 3)
3-5	--	Article Code Number
<hr/>		

D. Offending Youth

<hr/>		
		Age:
7-8	--	Preadolescent (</= 12 years)
10-11	--	Adolescent (13-18 years)
13-14	--	Adult (>/= 19 years)
<hr/>		
		Sex:
16-17	--	Male
19-20	--	Female
<hr/>		
		Source of Referral:
22-23	--	Self
25-26	--	Probation/Parole
28-29	--	Lawyer/Legal Aide
31-32	--	Therapist (other clinician)
34-35	--	Family Member
37-38	--	Friend
40-41	--	Media
43-44	--	Child Protection Agency
46-47	--	Courts
49-50	--	Other
<hr/>		

ASOMAV3.DAT

3

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
52-53	--	Education Level: <= 6th Grade
55-56	--	<= 9th Grade
58-59	--	High school Grad.
61-62	--	<= 2 years College
64-65	--	4-year College Grad.
67-68	--	Graduate School
1-2	04	Record (Med/Psych History)
3-5	--	Article Code Number
<u>A. Parental</u>		
7-8	--	Maternal Substance Abuse: Alcohol
10-11	--	Drugs
13-14	--	Paternal Substance Abuse: Alcohol
16-17	--	Drugs
19-20	--	Maternal Psychiatric Diagnoses: Specify _____
22-23	--	Paternal Psychiatric Diagnoses: Specify _____
<u>B. Offender Medical</u>		
25-26	--	Physical Illness/Injury: Enuresis
28-29	--	Head Injury
31-32	--	Blackouts
34-35	--	Disability Yes (specify _____)
37-38	--	No
<u>C. Offender Psychiatric</u>		
40-41	--	Characterological Orientation: Borderline Traits
43-44	--	Antisocial Traits
46-47	--	Histrionic Traits
49-50	--	DSM-III-R Diagnoses: Conduct Disorder
52-53	--	Identity Disorder
55-56	--	Oppositional Disorder
58-59	--	Other (specify _____)

ASOMAV3.DAT

4

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
<u>D. Previous Therapeutic Treatment/Counseling</u>		
61-62	--	Nonsex Offense Related:
64-65	--	Yes
		No
67-68	--	Sex Offense Related:
70-71	--	Yes
		No
1-2	05	Record (Family Variables 1)
3-5	--	Article Code Number

A. Family Interaction Style

7-8	--	Adaptability:
10-11	--	Flexible/Structured
		Chaotic/Rigid
13-14	--	Cohesion:
16-17	--	Separated/Connected
		Disengaged/Enmeshed

B. Intrafamily Violence/Neglect

19-20	--	Perps. Physical Abuse:
22-23	--	Father
25-26	--	Mother
28-29	--	Siblings
		Other (i.e. extended family)
31-32	--	Victims Physical Abuse:
34-35	--	Father
37-38	--	Mother
40-41	--	Siblings
		Other (i.e. extended family)
43-44	--	Perps. Emo/phys neglect:
46-47	--	Father
49-50	--	Mother
52-53	--	Siblings
		Other (i.e. extended family)
55-56	--	Victims Emo/phys neglect:
58-59	--	Father
61-62	--	Mother
64-65	--	Siblings
		Other (i.e. extended family)

ASOMAV3.DAT

5

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
		Perps. Sexual Abuse:
67-68	--	Father
70-71	--	Mother
73-74	--	Siblings
76-77	--	Other (i.e. extended family)
		Victims Sexual Abuse:
79-80	--	Father
82-83	--	Mother
85-86	--	Siblings
87-88	--	Other (i.e. extended family)
1-2	06	Record (Family Variables 2)
3-5	--	Article Code Number

C. Intragenerational Sexual Abuse

		Father's Perpetrator:
7-8	--	Mother (Stepmother)
10-11	--	Father (Stepfather)
13-14	--	Brother (Stepbrother)
16-17	--	Sister (Stepsister)
19-20	--	Other
		Mother's Perpetrator:
22-23	--	Mother (Stepmother)
25-26	--	Father (Stepfather)
28-29	--	Brother (Stepbrother)
31-32	--	Sister (Stepsister)
34-35	--	Other
		Sibling's Perpetrator:
37-38	--	Mother (Stepmother)
40-41	--	Father (Stepfather)
43-44	--	Brother (Stepbrother)
46-47	--	Sister (Stepsister)
49-50	--	Other

D. Extrafamilial Sexual Abuse

		Perps. Sexual Abuse:
52-53	--	Father
55-56	--	Mother
58-59	--	Siblings
61-62	--	Other (i.e. extended family)

ASOMAV3.DAT

6

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
1-2	<u>07</u>	Record (Academic History)
3-5	- - -	Article Code Number

A. Educational History

7-8	- -	Extracurricular Activities:
10-11	- -	Sports
	- -	Social
		Academic Problems:
13-14	- -	Held Back (1+ grades)
16-17	- -	Learning Disabled
19-20	- -	Remedial Intervention
22-23	- -	Drop-out (Other)
		Estimated IQ:
25-26	- -	</= 85
28-29	- -	86-114
31-32	- -	>/= 115
34-35	- - -	Mean IQ
1-2	<u>08</u>	Record (Interpersonal 1)
3-5	- - -	Article Code Number

A. Family Oriented Interpersonal Relationships

7-8	- -	Social Isolation From Family:
10-11	- -	Mother
13-14	- -	Father
16-17	- -	Siblings
	- -	Others (extended)
		Involved in Family Activities:
19-20	- -	High
22-23	- -	Moderate
25-26	- -	Low

B. Peer Oriented Interpersonal Relationships

		Lacks Social Competence (same-sex peers):
28-29	- -	Social Skills
31-32	- -	Adaptive Behaviors
34-35	- -	Body Image
37-38	- -	Self-Esteem
40-41	- -	Other (general)

ASOMAV3.DAT

7

<u>COLUMN/POSITION</u>	<u>ENTRY</u>	<u>DESCRIPTION</u>
		Lacks Social Competence (Opposite-sex peers):
43-44	--	Social Skills
46-47	--	Adaptive Behaviors
49-50	--	Body Image
52-53	--	Self-Esteem
55-56	--	Other (general)
		Isolation From Peers:
58-59	--	Same-sex
61-62	--	Opposite-sex
		Association With Deviant Peer Group:
64-65	--	Sexually Deviant Behavior
67-68	--	Nonsexually Deviant Behavior
<u>C. Authority Oriented Interpersonal Relationships</u>		
		Problematic Relationships With:
70-71	--	School Officials
73-74	--	Law Enforcement
76-77	--	Occupational Authority
1-2	09	Record (Interpersonal 2)
3-5	--	Article Code Number

D. Biosocial Interaction Characteristics

		General Affective:
7-8	--	Irritability
10-11	--	Hostility
13-14	--	Impulsivity
16-17	--	Social Anxiety
		General Cognitive:
19-20	--	Low Tolerance
22-23	--	Uncooperative Behavior
25-26	--	Low Achievement Orientation
28-29	--	Lacks Long-Range Goals
		Gender Climate Orientation:
31-32	--	Hypermasculine
34-35	--	Feminine
37-38	--	Stereotypic

ASOMAV3.DAT

8

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
<u>E. Identity Status/Developmental Level</u>		
40-41	--	Eriksonian/Marcia:
43-44	--	Achieved
46-47	--	Moratorium
49-50	--	Foreclosed
		Diffused
		General:
52-53	--	Identity Established
55-56	--	Identity Ambiguous
1-2	10	Record (Offender Victimization History 1)
3-5	--	Article Code Number

A. Physical Abuse

7-8	--	General: Percent Sample Abused
		Perpetrator:
10-11	--	Father
13-14	--	Stepfather
16-17	--	Mother
19-20	--	Stepmother
22-23	--	Brother
25-26	--	Step or halfbrother
28-29	--	Sister
31-32	--	Step or halfsister
34-35	--	Extended Family Member
37-38	--	Babysitter
40-41	--	Other

B. Physical/Emotional Neglect

43-44	--	General: Percent Sample Neglected
		Perpetrator:
46-47	--	Father
49-50	--	Stepfather
52-53	--	Mother
55-56	--	Stepmother
58-59	--	Brother
61-62	--	Step or halfbrother
64-65	--	Sister
67-68	--	Step or halfsister
70-71	--	Extended Family Member
73-74	--	Babysitter
76-77	--	Other

ASOMAV3.DAT
9

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
1-2	11	Record (Offender Victimization History 2)
3-5	---	Article Code Number

C. Sexual Trauma

7-8	--	General: Percent Sample Traumatized:
10-11	--	Perpetrator: Father
13-14	--	Stepfather
16-17	--	Mother
19-20	--	Stepmother
22-23	--	Brother
25-26	--	Step or halfbrother
28-29	--	Sister
31-32	--	Step or halfsister
34-35	--	Extended Family Member
37-38	--	Babysitter
40-41	--	Other

D. Sexual Abuse

43-44	--	General: Percent Sample Abused
46-47	--	Perpetrator: Father
49-50	--	Stepfather
52-53	--	Mother
55-56	--	Stepmother
58-59	--	Brother
61-62	--	Step or halfbrother
64-65	--	Sister
67-68	--	Step or halfsister
70-71	--	Extended Family Member
73-74	--	Babysitter
76-77	--	Other

1-2	12	Record (Offender Sexual History 1)
3-5	---	Article Code Number

A. Sex Education (Human Reproduction)

7-8	--	Family Taught: Yes
10-11	--	No
13-14	--	Age Taught

ASOMAV3.DAT
10

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
16-17	--	School Taught: Yes
19-20	--	No
22-23	--	Grade Taught
B. Sex Education (Contraception)		
25-26	--	Family Taught: Yes
28-29	--	No
31-32	--	Age Taught
34-35	--	School Taught: Yes
37-38	--	No
40-41	--	Grade Taught
C. First Sexual Encounter With A Peer		
43-44	--	Age (Heterosexual): </= 6 years
46-47	--	7-12 years
49-50	--	13-15 years
52-53	--	16-18 years
55-56	--	> 18 years
58-59	--	Age (Homosexual): </= 6 years
61-62	--	7-12 years
64-65	--	13-15 years
67-68	--	16-18 years
70-71	--	> 18 years
1-2	13	Record (Offender Sexual History 2)
3-5	--	Article Code Number

D. Masturbatory History (Sexualized)

7-8	--	Age At First Act: </= 5 years
10-11	--	6-12 years
13-14	--	13-15 years
16-17	--	16-18 years
19-20	--	> 18 years

ASOMAV3.DAT
11

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
<hr/>		
		Masturbation Frequency:
22-23	--	More Than Once/Day
25-26	--	Every Day
28-29	--	3 Times/Week
31-32	--	1 Time/Week
34-35	--	2 Times/Month
37-38	--	1 Time/Month
40-41	--	< 1 Time/Month
<hr/>		
<u>E. Pornography</u>		
		Uses Pornography:
43-44	--	Yes
46-47	--	No
<hr/>		
<u>F. Drugs/Alcohol</u>		
		Substance Use In Conjunction With Sexual Behavior:
49-50	--	Yes
52-53	--	No
<hr/>		
1-2	14	Record (Offender Criminal History 1)
3-5	--	Article Code Number
<hr/>		
<u>A. Nonsexual Offenses</u>		
		General/Unspecified:
7-8	--	Arson
10-11	--	Theft
13-14	--	Assault (nonsexual)
16-17	--	Alcohol Use/Abuse
19-20	--	Drug Use/Abuse
22-23	--	Alcohol/Drug Abuse*
25-26	--	Truancy
28-29	--	Other
<hr/>		
		School Related:
31-32	--	Arson
34-35	--	Theft
37-38	--	Assault (nonsexual)
40-41	--	Alcohol Use/Abuse
43-44	--	Drug Use/Abuse
46-47	--	Alcohol/Drug Abuse*
49-50	--	Truancy
52-53	--	Other

* Code where no differentiation is made between alcohol and drug use/abuse.

ASOMAV3.DAT
12

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
		Home Related:
55-56	--	Arson
58-59	--	Theft
61-62	--	Assault (nonsexual)
64-65	--	Alcohol Use/Abuse
67-68	--	Drug Use/Abuse
70-71	--	Alcohol/Drug Abuse*
73-74	--	Truancy
76-77	--	Other
1-2	15	Record (Offender Criminal History 2)
3-5	-- --	Article Code Number
		Group Offenses:
7-8	--	Arson
10-11	--	Theft
13-14	--	Assault (nonsexual)
16-17	--	Alcohol Use/Abuse
19-20	--	Drug Use/Abuse
22-23	--	Alcohol/Drug Abuse*
25-26	--	Truancy
28-29	--	Other
		History of Cruelty To Animals:
31-32	--	Yes
34-35	--	No
		History Of Arson:
37-38	--	Yes
40-41	--	No
43-44	--	Mean Age At First Act
		Court Dispositions:
46-47	--	Acquitted
49-50	--	Sentence Suspended
52-53	--	Probation
55-56	--	Incarcerated
58-59	--	Court-Ordered Treatment
		Other Offense Data:
61-62	--	Percentage Subjects Convicted of Misdemeanor Offenses
64-65	--	Percentage Subjects Convicted of Felony Offenses

* Code where no differentiation is made between alcohol and drug use/abuse.

ASOMAV3.DAT
13

COLUMN/POSITION	ENTRY	DESCRIPTION
1-2	16	Record (Offender Criminal History 3)
3-5	--	Article Code Number

B. Sexual Offenses

		Offender Age At First Offense:
7-8	--	<= 5 years
10-11	--	6-12 years
13-14	--	13-15 years
16-17	--	16-18 years
19-20	--	> 18 years
		Type of First Offense:
22-23	--	Pedophilia (Homosexual)
25-26	--	Pedophilia (Heterosexual)
28-29	--	Pedophilia (Unknown)
31-32	--	Assault (Includes Rape)
34-35	--	Exhibitionism
37-38	--	Voyeurism
40-41	--	Other (Undifferentiated)
		Age of First Victim:
43-44	--	Sig. Younger
46-47	--	Peer Age
49-50	--	Sig. Older
52-53	--	Unknown
		Sex Of First Victims:
55-56	--	Same as Perp.
58-59	--	Opposite of Perp.
61-62	--	Unknown
		Victim Consent:
64-65	--	Victim Implied Consent
67-68	--	Use Of Verbal Coercion
70-71	--	Use Of Physical Force
1-2	17	Record (Offender Criminal History 4)
3-5	--	Article Code Number

C. Mean Number Of Total Reported Offenses By Type

7-9	--	Pedophilia (Homosexual)
11-13	--	Pedophilia (Heterosexual)
15-17	--	Pedophilia (Unknown)
19-21	--	Assault (Includes Rape)
23-25	--	Exhibitionism
27-29	--	Voyeurism
31-33	--	Other (Undifferentiated)

ASOMAV3.DAT

14

D. Number Of Reported Separated Victims

35-36		1
38-39	--	2-5
41-42	--	6-10
44-45	--	11-25
47-48	--	26-50
50-51	--	51-100
53-54	--	> 100

E. Victim General Information

56-57	--	Age Of Victims:
59-60	--	Sig. Younger
62-63	--	Peer Age
65-66	--	Sig. Older
	--	Mixed
		Sex Of Victims:
68-69	--	Same As Perpetrator
71-72	--	Opposite From Perpetrator
74-75	--	Mixed
		Victim Consent:
77-78	--	Victims Implied Consent
80-81	--	Use of Verbal Coercion
83-84	--	Use of Physical Force
86-87	--	Mixed

Note: Put any information you believe to be relevant to our study in the space below. If possible, note both the item and the percentage of the sample that meets the item's criteria.

APPENDIX D
INTERRATER RELIABILITIES

APPENDIX D
INTERRATER RELIABILITIES

Table 19

Interrater Reliabilities for 20 Objective and 3 Subjective Variables (Rounded to the nearest .01)

Sample	Kappa (k)			
	1	2	3	Mean (k)
<u>Objective Variables</u>				
Subgroup Classification	.81	.88	.94	.88
Family Type	.94	.95	.98	.96
Ethnicity	.99	1.00	1.00	1.00
Referral Source	.79	.86	.88	.84
Religion	.84	.96	.98	.93
Offender				
Medical History	.85	.91	.94	.90
Social Skills Deficit	.86	.91	.96	.91
Social Isolation	.88	.91	.91	.90
Academic Problems	.82	.92	.94	.89
General Affective	.78	.85	.96	.86
Neglect (Offender)	.91	.92	.93	.92
Sexual Abuse (Offender)	.92	.93	.99	.95
Offender's Age				
(1st Offense)	.82	.90	.93	.88
Victim Ages (All)	.85	.92	.93	.90
Sex of victims (All)	.82	.82	.96	.87
<u>Subjective Variables</u>				
Sample quality	.73	.82	.89	.81
Family				
Interaction Style	.66	.73	.80	.73
Characterological				
Orientation	.66	.68	.75	.70

APPENDIX E
DESCRIPTIVES FOR QUALITY 1 - 2 SAMPLES

APPENDIX E

DESCRIPTIVES FOR QUALITY 1 - 2 SAMPLES

Table 20

General Demographic Characteristics for Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Family Type:				
Biological	46 (26, 03)	49 (33, 05)	37 (15, 14)	41 (21, 22)
Blended	n/a	n/a	16 (10, 05)	19 (11, 06)
Single	78 (14, 04)	38 (23, 05)	40 (19, 12)	47 (24, 21)
Foster (Other)	28 (04, 02)	51 (47, 03)	27 (28, 14)	31 (30, 19)
Ethnicity:				
Caucasian	65 (30, 13)	59 (36, 11)	55 (33, 31)	58 (32, 57)
Black	31 (23, 12)	41 (28, 10)	38 (28, 23)	37 (26, 47)
Hispanic	13 (13, 05)	21 (08, 06)	19 (13, 12)	18 (12, 25)
Oriental	n/a	n/a	2 (01, 04)	1 (01, 05)
Native American	n/a	n/a	3 (01, 03)	2 (01, 05)
Mixed (Other)	n/a	5 (05, 02)	26 (32, 18)	23 (30, 21)
SES/Income:				
Upper				
(\$60,000+)	12 (01, 02)	n/a	n/a	11 (05, 04)
Middle				
(\$15,000-59,000)	38 (28, 03)	61 (11, 02)	40 (41, 05)	44 (32, 10)

(table continues)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
SES/Income (cont.):				
Lower				
(<\$15,000)	45 (32, 02)	39 (12, 02)	65 (28, 04)	58 (29, 09)
Referral Source:				
Self	52 (41, 03)	n/a	n/a	75 (37, 06)
Probation/Parole	12 (13, 02)	57 (39, 05)	n/a	43 (37, 08)
Lawyer	n/a	n/a	15 (13, 03)	15 (13, 03)
Clinician	n/a	83 (40, 06)	68 (43, 08)	79 (38, 17)
Family Member	n/a	n/a	9 (04, 02)	9 (04, 02)
Child Protection	n/a	17 (06, 02)	59 (38, 07)	45 (38, 10)
Juvenile Court	83 (32, 05)	80 (33, 03)	65 (31, 10)	74 (31, 19)
Other	76 (43, 04)	67 (37, 05)	51 (35, 11)	60 (37, 20)
Education Level:				
<= 6th Grade	34 (29, 02)	n/a	n/a	42 (36, 05)
<= 9th Grade	46 (31, 06)	49 (07, 02)	n/a	56 (33, 10)
High School Grad.	33 (19, 05)	n/a	88 (18, 03)	54 (31, 09)
<= 2 yrs College	22 (14, 02)	n/a	32 (23, 03)	28 (16, 06)
4 yr College Grad.	12 (03, 04)	15 (01, 02)	n/a	13 (03, 06)
Graduate School	n/a	n/a	n/a	40 (51, 03)
Religion:				
Catholic	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Protestant (other)	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a

Note. Post-high school education data is entirely derived from adult retrospective accounts.

Table 21

Parental and Family Characteristics for Youth Sex Offenders (Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Alcohol Abuse:				
Maternal	17 (04, 03)	19 (08, 03)	39 (35, 05)	28 (25, 11)
Paternal	53 (04, 02)	60 (38, 04)	46 (09, 04)	53 (24, 10)
Drug Abuse:				
Maternal	25 (07, 02)	n/a	51 (31, 06)	43 (27, 09)
Paternal	n/a	n/a	n/a	58 (02, 02)
Mental Illness:				
Maternal	n/a	29 (13, 02)	13 (11, 03)	20 (12, 06)
Paternal	n/a	18 (02, 02)	4 (01, 02)	12 (07, 05)
History of Child Neglect:				
Maternal	n/a	n/a	57 (10, 02)	42 (26, 03)
Paternal	n/a	n/a	n/a	54 (43, 03)
History of Child Physical Abuse:				
Maternal	n/a	n/a	n/a	57 (28, 04)
Paternal	33 (09, 03)	52 (34, 04)	11 (05, 03)	36 (27, 11)

(table continues)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
History of Child Sexual Abuse:				
Maternal	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Paternal	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Maternal History of Childhood Victimization:				
Neglect	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Physical Abuse	37 (09, 02)	64 (25, 04)	39 (41, 04)	48 (31, 10)
Sexual Abuse	n/a	n/a	22 (14, 05)	24 (13, 06)
Paternal History of Childhood Victimization:				
Neglect	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Physical Abuse	n/a	n/a	n/a	32 (16, 02)
Sexual Abuse	n/a	n/a	8 (03, 02)	8 (03, 02)
Family Interaction Style (Adaptability):				
Flexible/Structured	n/a	n/a	n/a	42 (06, 02)
Chaotic/Rigid	54 (50, 03)	n/a	68 (27, 03)	71 (35, 08)

(table continues)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Family Interaction				
Style (Cohesion):				
Separated/ Connected	n/a	n/a	n/a	53 (38, 04)
Disengaged/ Enmeshed	50 (49, 03)	99 (00, 03)	47 (04, 02)	68 (37, 08)

Table 22

Youth Sex Offender Medical/Psychiatric Histories (Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Sub Variable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Medical History of:				
Enuresis	43 (07, 03)	n/a	25 (13, 04)	33 (14, 07)
Head Injury	33 (24, 02)	n/a	n/a	48 (32, 05)
Blackouts	37 (18, 02)	n/a	n/a	33 (15, 03)
Unspecified Disability	n/a	n/a	5 (03, 02)	5 (03, 02)
Characterological Orientation/Traits:				
Borderline	9 (10, 02)	n/a	47 (39, 04)	43 (41, 07)
Antisocial	20 (15, 02)	n/a	35 (16, 03)	37 (30, 07)
DSM-III-R Diagnosis:				
Conduct Disorder	n/a	n/a	49 (14, 03)	49 (14, 03)
Unspecified Diagnosis	10 (07, 04)	36 (25, 02)	40 (13, 04)	31 (23, 11)
History of Psychological Intervention:				
Offense Related	52 (54, 02)	n/a	65 (34, 03)	64 (39, 08)
Other	n/a	n/a	65 (23, 04)	56 (28, 05)

Table 23

Youth Sex Offender Educational Histories (Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Extracurricular Activities:				
Sports	n/a	n/a	n/a	61 (38, 03)
Social Clubs	n/a	n/a	n/a	15 (06, 02)
Academic Problems:				
Retained (1+ Grades)	n/a	n/a	59 (14, 04)	52 (19, 05)
Learning Disabled	n/a	n/a	41 (18, 07)	43 (29, 09)
Remedial Intervention	n/a	n/a	53 (23, 04)	57 (25, 07)
Estimated IQ:				
<= 85	n/a	15 (04, 02)	24 (06, 03)	25 (13, 06)
86-114	46 (10, 02)	82 (00, 02)	58 (04, 02)	62 (17, 06)
>=115	n/a	n/a	12 (03, 02)	10 (04, 03)
Mean IQ	95 (05, 04)	99 (07, 05)	98 (07, 15)	98 (07, 24)

Table 24

Youth Sex Offender Interpersonal Relationship Characteristics (Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Social				
Isolation from:				
Mother	n/a	n/a	n/a	60 (33, 02)
Father	n/a	n/a	n/a	58 (43, 04)
Lacks Social				
Skills with:				
Female Peers	34 (06, 02)	65 (49, 02)	75 (21, 08)	69 (28, 13)
Male Peers	24 (21, 02)	44 (50, 03)	68 (21, 08)	59 (33, 14)
Lacks Social				
Confidence with:				
Female Peers	n/a	n/a	99 (00, 03)	85 (35, 06)
Male Peers	n/a	n/a	n/a	99 (00, 04)
Social				
Isolation from:				
Female Peers	23 (13, 02)	90 (13, 06)	76 (21, 06)	75 (28, 15)
Male Peers	23 (13, 02)	90 (13, 06)	71 (18, 08)	72 (26, 16)

Table 25

Youth Sex Offender General Behavioral Interaction Characteristics(Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
General Affective:				
Hostility	n/a	70 (36, 04)	72 (16, 06)	71 (26, 13)
Impulsivity	37 (32, 03)	99 (00, 03)	46 (18, 05)	58 (32, 11)
Social Anxiety	n/a	n/a	52 (02, 02)	67 (27, 03)
General Cognitive:				
Uncooperative	68 (10, 02)	n/a	87 (10, 03)	75 (33, 08)
Low Achievement	n/a	n/a	n/a	59 (50, 03)

Table 26

History of Childhood Victimization and Perpetrators in Youth Sex Offenders
(Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault Mean% (SD, n)	Pedophilic Mean% (SD, n)	Mixed Offense Mean% (SD, n)	Combined Mean% (SD, n)
Neglect:	36 (21, 03)	76 (21, 03)	24 (34, 03)	45 (33, 09)
Perpetrator: Mother	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Sexual Abuse:	39 (22, 09)	51 (24, 07)	33 (22, 22)	38 (23, 38)
Perpetrator:				
Father	n/a	n/a	11 (14, 04)	15 (15, 05)
Mother	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
Brother	n/a	n/a	4 (02, 02)	4 (02, 02)
Extended Family				
Member	n/a	n/a	11 (07, 05)	12 (07, 08)
Baby Sitter	n/a	n/a	4 (02, 05)	6 (04, 06)
Physical Abuse:	46 (16, 07)	52 (28, 06)	30 (22, 15)	40 (24, 29)
Perpetrator:				
Father	27 (03, 02)	n/a	12 (03, 02)	39 (34, 06)
Sexual Trauma:	26 (12, 04)	22 (16, 02)	29 (30, 02)	26 (15, 08)

Table 27

History of Nonsex Criminal Offenses and Outcomes in Youth Sex Offenders(Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
General:				
Arson	28 (13, 02)	n/a	36 (24, 07)	27 (23, 12)
Theft	n/a	n/a	32 (21, 08)	34 (21, 09)
Assault	n/a	n/a	56 (33, 04)	50 (31, 06)
Alcohol				
Use/Abuse	n/a	n/a	38 (20, 05)	42 (20, 06)
Drug				
Use/Abuse	n/a	n/a	20 (27, 05)	23 (25, 06)
Mixed Alcohol/ Drug Abuse	n/a	n/a	59 (47, 03)	59 (47, 03)
Truancy	n/a	n/a	27 (20, 03)	29 (16, 04)
Animal Cruelty	31 (18, 03)	43 (51, 03)	26 (18, 08)	29 (26, 15)
Other	n/a	n/a	55 (18, 11)	52 (17, 14)
Dispositions:				
Acquitted/Charges				
Dropped	42 (24, 03)	n/a	66 (29, 05)	58 (26, 09)
Probation	n/a	n/a	40 (11, 04)	35 (12, 06)
Incarceration	64 (40, 06)	n/a	36 (33, 07)	58 (31, 17)
Court-Ordered Treatment	10 (07, 02)	37 (54, 03)	77 (44, 04)	49 (48, 09)

Table 28

Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics for First Reported Sex Offense(Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Offender's Age:				
<= 5 Years	n/a	n/a	n/a	9 (06, 02)
6-12 years	27 (36, 02)	n/a	83 (27, 03)	75 (36, 08)
13-15 years	67 (28, 03)	n/a	n/a	58 (29, 04)
Victim's Age with				
Respect to Offender:				
Sig. Younger	n/a	99 (00, 03)	65 (27, 08)	72 (28, 14)
Peer	n/a	n/a	26 (14, 06)	42 (34, 09)
Sig. Older	n/a	n/a	28 (19, 04)	32 (17, 06)
Sex of Victim:				
Female	32 (26, 02)	n/a	73 (18, 04)	78 (22, 10)
Male	81 (21, 04)	n/a	20 (14, 03)	44 (36, 08)

Table 29

Youth Sex Offender and Offense Characteristics For All Reported Offenses(Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Number of				
Separate Victims:				
1	n/a	57 (42, 03)	52 (26, 06)	52 (28, 10)
2-5	n/a	55 (43, 05)	42 (26, 09)	48 (29, 17)
6-10	n/a	n/a	11 (03, 03)	12 (05, 05)
11-25	n/a	n/a	9 (05, 03)	12 (07, 04)
26+	n/a	n/a	6 (05, 03)	25 (42, 05)
Victim Age's with				
Respect to Offender:				
Sig. Younger	41 (08, 05)	99 (00, 12)	69 (23, 19)	75 (26, 36)
Peer	52 (31, 07)	n/a	36 (23, 13)	44 (29, 21)
Sig. Older	11 (05, 03)	n/a	29 (33, 10)	25 (30, 13)
Mixed	77 (38, 03)	n/a	75 (41, 03)	80 (33, 07)
Sex of Victims:				
Female	66 (32, 06)	51 (19, 06)	66 (25, 17)	63 (25, 29)
Male	49 (29, 04)	40 (19, 06)	35 (18, 14)	38 (20, 24)
Mixed	66 (57, 03)	72 (42, 09)	40 (41, 07)	61 (44, 20)

(table continues)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Offender Coercion:				
No Coercion/Force	n/a	18 (01, 02)	13 (14, 02)	16 (09, 04)
Verbal Coercion	n/a	65 (29, 07)	49 (30, 16)	54 (30, 23)
Physical Force	57 (43, 02)	45 (39, 08)	47 (28, 12)	48 (32, 23)

Table 30

Youth Sex Offender Characteristics Allegedly Related to Offense Behavior(Quality 1 and 2 Samples)

Variable	Type of Offender			
	Sexual Assault	Pedophilic	Mixed Offense	Combined
Subvariable	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)	Mean% (SD, n)
Use of Pornography as a Sexual Stimuli:	94 (07, 02)	n/a	n/a	94 (07, 02)
Use of Alcohol/Drugs as Disinhibitors:	36 (21, 04)	n/a	33 (33, 05)	38 (28, 10)

APPENDIX F

A LISTING OF SAMPLE SOURCES USED IN THIS META-ANALYSIS

APPENDIX F

A LISTING OF SAMPLE SOURCES USED IN THIS META-ANALYSIS

The following is an alphabetical listing of the study samples that were analyzed in this research. Some studies provided more than one sample. Complete references are provided in the reference section.

- | | |
|--|---------------------------|
| Able et al. (1977). | Able et al. (1988). |
| Able et al. (1987). | Able et al. (1981). |
| Anderson et al. (1979). | Anechiarco, B. (1990). |
| Armentrout & Hauer (1978). | Baxter et al. (1984). |
| Becker et al. (1991). | Becker et al. (1986). |
| Becker et al. (1989). | Becker et al. (1986). |
| Becker et al. (1988). | Bengis, S. M. (1986). |
| Berach & Myers (1983). | |
| Betha-Jackson & Brissett-Chapman (1989). | |
| Bischof & Stith (1991). | Blaske et al. (1989). |
| Bliss & Larson (1985). | Bradford et al. (1988). |
| Brickman et al. (1984). | Burgess et al. (1988a). |
| Burgess et al. (1988b). | Cohen et al. (1989). |
| Conte et al. (1989). | Cooper et al. (1990). |
| Deisher et al. (1982). | DeJong et al. (1989). |
| Dept. HHS, (1985). | Dutton & Newlon (1988). |
| Dwyer, S. M. (1988). | Dwyer & Amberson (1989) |
| English et al. (1991). | English et al. (1991). |
| Fagan & Wexler (1988). | Fehrenbach et al. (1986). |

- Freeman-Longo, R. E. (1986).
Friedrich et al. (1988).
Gilgun et al. (1990).
Groth, N. A. (1977).
Groth et al. (1982).
Hall et al. (1988).
Heinz et al. (1987).
Hendricks et al. (1988).
Johnson, T. C. (1988).
Kahn et al. (1988).
Kaplan et al. (1991a).
Kavoussi et al. (1988).
Knopp et al. (1987).
Lang et al. (1985).
Lee et al. (1991).
Lewis et al. (1979).
Longo et al. (1983).
Margolin, L. (1984).
McConaghy et al. (1985).
McConaghy et al. (1988).
McCraw & Pegg-McNab (1989).
Morolla & Scully (1986).
O'Brien, M. J. (1982).
Petrovich & Templer (1984).
Pithers et al. (1988).
Prendergast, W. E. (1979).
Freund et al. (1990).
Gilby et al. (1989).
Gomez-Schwartz et al. (1988).
Groth & Birnbaum (1978).
Haines et al. (1986).
Hall, G. C. N. (1980).
Henderson et al. (1989).
Hunter & Santos (1990).
Johnston & Johnston (1986).
Kaplan et al. (1990).
Kaplan et al. (1991b).
Kempton et al. (1992).
Laben et al. (1991).
Langevin et al. (1989).
Levin & Stava (1987).
Longo, R. E. (1982).
Longo et al. (1981).
Marshall, W. L. (1988).
McConaghy et al. (1989).
Mio et al. (1986).
Mrasek, D. A. (1983).
Overholser & Beck (1986).
Pierce et al. (1987).
Pontius, A. A. (1988).
Prentky & Carter (1984).

- Prentky et al. (1985). Prentky & Knight (1986).
Prentky et al. (1988). Prentky et al. (1989).
Ressler et al. (1986).
Rotheram-Borus et al. (1991). Ryan et al. (1987).
Saunders et al. (1986). Saunders & Awad (1991).
Scavo & Buchanan (1989). Segal & Marshall (1985).
Segal & Marshall (1986). Seghorn et al. (1987).
Seltzer & Langford (1984). Shoor et al. (1966).
Smith, W. R. (1988). Smith & Monastersky (1986).
Smith et al. (1987). Stermac & Hall (1989).
Stevenson et al. (1989). Sugar, M. (1983).
Tarter et al. (1983). Tingle et al. (1986).
VanNess, S. R. (1984). Vinogradov et al. (1988).

VITA

NAME: Roger B. Graves **SSN:** 549-04-3102

SPOUSE: Gena

CHILDREN: Andrea, Gaelan

WORK ADDRESS: Southcentral Foundation
670 West Fireweed Ln.
Anchorage, AK 99503

PHONE: (907) 265-4912 **FAX:** (907) 265-5925

HOME ADDRESS: 3820 W. 72nd Ct
Anchorage, AK 99502

PHONE: (907) 243-6352

DEGREES:

Ph.D. Utah State University, Logan, Utah
Major: Developmental Psychology
In Progress, expected date of completion
January, 1994.

M.S. Utah State University, Logan Utah
Major: Family and Human Development
Degree awarded December, 1990.

B.S. Brigham Young University, Provo, Utah
Major: Psychology
Degree awarded June, 1987.

PROFESSIONAL ASSOCIATIONS:

American Psychological Association (Student Affiliate,
Division 7)

SPECIAL RECOGNITION:

Phi Kappa Phi Honor Society. Elected in 1989 for
outstanding academic performance in graduate school.

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY:

1990-1992 Teaching Assistant, Utah State
University, Logan, Utah

Roger B. Graves

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY (Continued):

Assistantship in the Department of Psychology. Taught Human Development (Psychology 110).

Supervisor: Dr. Frank Ascione.

Duties: Taught six quarters, was responsible for preparing materials and lecturing to classes ranging in size from 30 to 130 students. Also responsible for keeping materials updated, grading and counselling students on class related matters. Taught four of the six quarters unsupervised, that is, was given full control over the curriculum, class format and grading procedures.

1990-1992 Graduate Tutor, Utah State University

Contracted with the Department of Psychology. Tutored for Developmental Psychology (Psychology 712), Social Psychology (Psychology 713) and Neurophysiology (Psychology 710)

Supervisor: Dr. Carolyn Barcus.

Duties: Assisted doctoral students with course work on an individual basis.

1985-1990 Therapist, Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Center, Salt Lake City & Logan, Utah

Supervisors: Dr. C.Y. Roby, Dr. Carolyn Barcus.

Duties: Administered and interpreted approximately 500 psychophysiological assessments (penile plethysmographs) on adult and adolescent clients referred for sex-related offenses. Conducted approximately 1200 hours of individual therapy, 500 hours of group therapy and 100 hours of family therapy. Psychotherapy clientele generally consisted of children and adolescents referred for a variety of reasons. Conducted psychological testing and evaluations, developed treatment plans, interviewed sexual abuse victims for the Utah Department of Family Services and prepared and presented case recommendations for the Juvenile court.

1985-1987 Utah Valley Family Support Center, Provo, Utah

Roger B. Graves

EMPLOYMENT HISTORY (Continued):

1/85-10/85. Volunteer in the respite care nursery.
Duties: Provided direct care to infants and children to age 12.

10/85-8/86. Resident Houseparent.
Duties: Lived at the center and was responsible for the supervision of all child care staff and volunteers, as well as personally responsible for night care and some weekend care of children.

7/86-8/87. Volunteer Coordinator/Weekend Houseparent/Children's Support Group Leader.

Supervisor: Susie Seggar, LCSW.

Duties: Obtaining and maintaining 300 hours of monthly volunteer assistance in the respite care nursery. Also provided direct care of children on alternating weekends and in emergencies. Developed and led a support group for children, assisted in a therapy group for sexually abused girls and assisted in a therapy group for divorced children.

1979-1984 Machinist/Structural Electrician,
Exploration Supply and Equipment Inc.
(EXSCO)
Anchorage, AK

Duties: Fabricated various items for the drilling industry. Also designed and installed the electrical supply systems for bush camps.

CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS ATTENDED:

The Ninth Annual Conference on Infancy and Childhood.

Sponsored by Utah State University. (1992).

Agenda: Multiple Personality disorder (diagnosis and intervention), family violence, conduct disorder, and street crime.

Therapy With Children Who Have Been Abused. Sponsored by Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Center, Logan, Utah. (1989).

Agenda: Assessment and intervention in sexually and physically abused children.

Roger B. Graves

CONFERENCES AND WORKSHOPS ATTENDED (Continued):

National Training Conference: Implementing an Intervention Continuum for the Youthful Sex Offender. Sponsored by The California Youth Authority, Long Beach, California. (1988).

Agenda: Assessment, diagnosis and intervention in adolescents and preadolescents offending sexually.

When the Victim is a Child. Sponsored by The Governor's Council on Victims and The Utah Commission on Criminal and Juvenile Justice, SLC, Utah. (1988).

Agenda: Child pornography, children as witnesses, techniques for interviewing children in law enforcement investigations.

Assessment and Treatment of Adult and Adolescent Sex Offenders. Sponsored by Intermountain Sexual Abuse Treatment Center--Sherwood Hills Summer Retreat (1987).

Agenda: Plethysmograph assessment and interpretation with adult sex offenders. Intervention with adult and adolescent sex offenders.

The Assessment and Treatment of Sex Offenders.

Sponsored by the Ferrall Institute (Ferrall Medical Instruments Inc. of Grand Island, Nebraska), Ogden, Utah. (1987).

Agenda: Specialized two-day training workshop specializing in the use of penile plethysmography in the assessment and treatment of sex offenders.

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS:

The Family, Religion and Education Interface: Understanding Adolescent and Young Adult Development. Sponsored by Brigham Young University and the Center for Studies of the Family's 19th Annual Conference, Provo, Utah. (1992).

Topic: Development of a Typology Profile of the Adolescent Sex Offender: An Evaluation of Demographic, Religious, and Education Variables.

National Conference on Family Relations (NCFR), New Orleans, Louisiana. (1989).

Topic: Poster presentation on Social Skills Training with Adolescent Sex Offenders.

Roger B. Graves

CONFERENCE PRESENTATIONS (Continued):

Adolescent Sex Offender Symposium. Sponsored by Intermountain sexual Abuse Treatment Center, Logan, Utah. (1989).

Topic: Intervention and the Development of Treatment Plans for Adolescent Sex Offenders (presented with Jill T. Morgan, LCSW).

American Association of Marriage and Family Therapists (AAMFT), fall, 1992.

Topic: Conceptualizing the Youthful Sex Offender: Implications for Intervention and Prevention.

National Conference on Family Relations (NCFR), fall, 1992.

Topic: Conceptualizing the Youthful Sex Offender: Implications for Intervention and Prevention.

RESEARCH AND PUBLICATIONS:

Graves, R.B., Openshaw, D.K., & Adams, G.R. (1992). Adolescent sex offenders and social skills training. International Journal of Offender Therapy and Comparative Criminology, 36(2) 139-153.

Openshaw, D.K., Graves, R.G., Ericksen, S.L., Lowery, M., Durso, D.D., Agee, L., Todd, S., Jones, K.E., & Scherzinger, J. (1993). Youthful sex offenders: A comprehensive bibliography of scholarly references, 1970-1992. Family Relations, 42, 222-226.

RESEARCH MANUSCRIPTS IN REVIEW/PREPARATION:

Openshaw, D.K., & Graves, R.B. Conceptualizing the youthful sex offender: A meta-analytic review of the last ten years. (In Preparation).

UNPUBLISHED MANUSCRIPTS:

Openshaw, D.K., Graves, R.B., Ericksen, S., Lowery, M., Agee, L., Todd, S., & Willey, G. (1992). Development of a typological profile of the adolescent sex offender: An evaluation of demographic, family, religious, and educational variables. (Presented at the Center for Studies of the Family's 19th Annual Conference. The Family, Religion, and Education Interface: Understanding Adolescent and Young Adult development, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT.)

Roger B. Graves

REFERENCES:

Dr. D. Kim Openshaw, Ph.D.
Dept. of Family and
Human Development
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322-2905
(801) 753-5696

Dr. Carolyn Barcus, Ph.D.
Dept. of Psychology
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322-2810
(801) 750-1465

Susie Seggar, LCSW
324 East Southfield
Spanish Fork, Utah 84660
(801) 798-8320

Dr. Frank Ascione, Ph.D.
Dept. of Psychology
Utah State University
Logan, Utah 84322-2810
(801) 759-1464

Dr. C.Y. Roby, Ph.D.
Executive Director
Intermountain Sexual
Abuse Treatment Ctr.
Salt Lake City, Utah
84115
(801) 486-9805

Carl Ivey
C/O EXSCO
6727 Old Seward Hwy
Anchorage, Alaska 99518
(907) 344-2589